92 Class D 85m Book
General Theological Seminary Library
Chelsea Square, New York

2/18/25

PRESENTED BY
Soc'y for Promoting Religion and Learning

DU BOSE MEMORIAL LECTURES

ALMAE MATRI SEWANENSI

DU BOSE AS A PROPHET OF UNITY

A Series of Lectures on the Du Bose Foundation delivered at the University of the South

BY THE REV.
J. O. F. MURRAY, D.D.,
Hon. D.D. Sewanee,
Master of Selwyn College, Cambridge,
and Hon. Canon of Ely Cathedral

THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY NEW YORK

LONDON
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
NEW YORK AND TORONTO : THE MACMILLAN CO.

Printed in Great Britain

92
D85m
77122

First published 1924.

NEW YORK

PREFACE

THIS book represents the Lectures given to the students of Theology at the University of the South, Sewanee, Tennessee, November 7th–10th, 1922, on the Du Bose Memorial Foundation.

William Porcher Du Bose was a South Carolinian of French Huguenot extraction. He was born April 11th, 1836, educated at the Military Academy of Charleston, S.C., and at the University of Virginia. He served with distinction in the Confederate forces 1860–65, first as an adjutant and then as a chaplain. After six years' practical experience he became Chaplain and Professor of Moral Philosophy and Christian Apologetics in the University of the South, at Sewanee, and served the University in various capacities for thirty-six years. He entered into rest on August 18th, 1918.

His thought was singularly penetrating and pregnant, dealing fearlessly with fundamental problems. It is embodied in seven volumes published between 1892 and 1911, supplemented by an important series of articles which appeared in the *Constructive Quarterly* between 1913 and 1921. His pupils have felt that his work has a significance which will not be exhausted in a single generation, that he has dug a well that goes down to eternal springs of the Well of Life. They have, therefore, established this lectureship to secure the continued attention of scholars and students to the issues raised by his contributions to philosophy and theology.

A lecturer on this foundation has, therefore, a wide field from which to select the subject of his course. There was, however, no room to doubt that the Inaugural Course of Lectures ought to be devoted to a study of the Master himself. This was, in spite of his manifold disqualifications, a thoroughly congenial choice for the lecturer. He was grateful for an opportunity of expressing his personal indebtedness to one whose writings had exercised a deep influence over his own thought life. He felt also that there were pressing reasons why the attention of theologians should at this time be called to the man and his work.

Du Bose is for various reasons far from being as well known outside the circle of his immediate disciples as he ought to be. His writings, in spite of their sterling qualities, and the high value set on them by a few well qualified judges, are in danger of drifting out of the ken even of serious students. His style, though it is not obscure, and has, as Bishop Talbot pointed out, a distinction of its own, is not easy. The exposition of his argument is unsystematic. He allows his thoughts to flow on freely, passing from one point to another by a law of natural association, rather than forcing them to advance by regulated steps to a predetermined goal. His chapters are in consequence hard to analyse, and his conclusions lack symmetrical completeness.

We must not, however, on the strength of this suppose that so true a disciple of Aristotle could tolerate carelessness in the use of terms, or confusion of thought. The fact is that his patience in holding his judgment in suspense—what a friend calls "his refusal to treat a point as settled until it was settled"—was only equalled by his eagerness in seeking for a clear-cut decision in which it would be possible to rest. Indeed this resolute

determination to see everything in the sharpest focus, and at the same time to avoid any premature attempt at harmonising apparent discords, is an intellectual asset as valuable as it is rare. At the same time it does not conduce to immediate popularity. No party capital can be made out of it. Its appeal is limited to the somewhat select circle of readers, who like to do their own thinking.

Such readers, however, should find Du Bose an author to their taste. But it is only fair to add that he was not only a thinker, who because he thought for himself naturally stimulates thought in others, he was a "Prophet." His interest in truth was not purely intellectual. It was, at the heart of it, moral and religious. His thinking is always in touch with spiritual reality. He speaks at first hand of God and from God. He is one of the few "voices" in the world, not one of the many "echoes." So to master his message requires not only concentrated attention, but an intensity of moral earnestness, a resolute determination to see each thought in its context in a life of loyal discipleship, which does not always accompany highly developed intellectual independence.

This must suffice on the externals of form and style. The heart of Du Bose's message, that which gives it its special significance and urgency for the time now present, is, as I pointed out in the title of my course, the stress that he laid on "Unity" as the key to all the deepest problems of life and thought. In the course of my exposition of his treatment of these problems, the delicacy and importance of the enquiries on which he embarked in the central department of Christology claimed a disproportionate share of my allotted space. And as there is a danger lest the interest which attaches

to these comparatively subordinate issues may distract attention from that which is truly central and fundamental it will be worth while to give here and now a rapid summary of " the Science of Christ," as it shaped itself in the course of Du Bose's thinking, to show how the thought of Unity is dominant in each department of it and in the whole.

1. Du Bose approached the problem first from the consideration of the nature and conditions of human salvation, from what he called " Soteriology."

His conclusions under this head were—

(*a*) that man was made for union with God :

(*b*) that he can only attain this, the true end of his being, under the condition on his side of " Holiness " :

(*c*) that in order to satisfy this condition he must by his own act bring the animal nature, which he inherits, into subjection to the law of right reason :

(*d*) that God supplies the power, which man unaided lacks, to satisfy this condition, by Grace through Faith—the Grace being revealed to man by His Word in Christ, and appropriated by man through the Faith which His Spirit quickens into action :

(*e*) that the Grace was revealed through the incarnation of the Word of God in human flesh by a living process, in which the activity of the Human Nature of the Man Christ Jesus supplied an essential element ; and *pari passu* through His conquest over Sin and Death under human conditions :

(*f*) that the fruits of His conquest are available for all men here and now " in fact," " by faith,"

first " for us " and then " in us," until at last we find Christ enthroned as King in our hearts through the operation of the Spirit of God our Father in the inner man.

The sum of the whole matter under this head then is this. A man finds " salvation " in proportion as his own being is " subdued out of distraction into unity," by being made " at one " with God and therefore " at one " with itself in Christ.

2. Salvation, however, cannot be fully understood so long as it is regarded merely as an individual concern. It is impossible to limit " the incarnation of the Divine in Human Flesh " to the " individual " incarnation, manifested in its historic process in the development and perfecting of the human nature and personality of Jesus from His birth at Bethlehem until He sat down with His Father on His Throne after His Ascension. For Jesus Christ, even as " an individual," stands in an unique and organic relation to every member of the race. No one of us, as the study of Salvation showed, can become his true self, or in Bible language " win his own soul," unless he surrenders it to Christ, becoming a living organ of His Will, an instrument for the manifestation of His abiding Presence by the execution of His purposes in the world. In so doing he is taken up into the incarnation of Jesus Christ. He becomes a member of His Body, and thereby in finding himself he finds also his fellow-members. He learns that he is no isolated independent unit, but part of a living whole, " the Great Church," membership in which is the primary fact for all who are alive to their relation to their Head—membership in any subordinate group, whether Anglican or any other, being secondary.

The foundation of this Great Inclusive Church is thus Jesus Christ, the Great Inclusive Truth, whom we each severally and in groups are striving to apprehend and express in human language to the best of our ability. For the Church, as a whole and in every part, lives by faith in Him, and its function is to bear witness to Him in the world as the Truth, the key to all human life and thought.

The Truth is one and unchangeable. But it is many-sided, and too vast to be grasped in its completeness by any individual or any group of individuals in isolation. Truth in every department of knowledge can only be grasped co-operatively. However much it must always owe to individual effort, it is always a corporate achievement. It is not surprising, therefore, to be told that the whole Truth can only be apprehended and expressed in communion, by the working together in due measure of every part of the Whole Body.

Meanwhile the deepest fact with regard to the Church is the Unity in which each several member of it is bound to all the rest in his Head Jesus Christ the Truth.

This brings us to what may well prove Du Bose's most important contribution to the life and thought of our time, his conception of the Truth as before all things the force that makes for Unity. This seems at first sight in flat contradiction with universal experience. And for this reason. Hitherto, especially in Theology, we have been terribly prone to identify our own opinions, our own individual constructions of the Truth down to the minutest details, with the Truth itself. And so we have made our several expressions of the Truth, our Creeds and Confessions, into instruments of exclusion.

Now, if Du Bose is right, in so doing we sin against the very spirit of the Truth itself, perpetuating and intensifying divisions in its sacred Name. Surely it will transfigure our whole outlook, and open the door to unsuspected possibilities of agreement in the Truth and of growth in the apprehension of it, if we can learn to regard all earnest seekers after Truth as fellow-workers to a common goal, instead of as open or concealed antagonists, who are the more insidious and the more dangerous, and therefore to be the more fiercely repudiated, the more nearly identical their systems as a whole are to our own? What if R. L. Stevenson is right, and the genuine touchstone of Truth is revealed by its power, not to convict all rival systems of error, but to help each to give clearer expression to the element of Truth contained in it?

This must suffice to indicate the place that Unity occupies in Du Bose's doctrine of the Church, and the significance for the individual believer of his membership in the One Body.

3. There remains a yet wider unity than can at present be included in the Great Church, however liberally we extend its borders. The Church is, no doubt, in idea, as Dr. Hort said, "nothing less than mankind knowing and fulfilling its destiny." But all do not yet know, and are not here and now fulfilling their destiny. And the function of the Church in the World is, as we have seen, to bear witness to the Truth, with a view to bringing all men to a knowledge of their destiny and enabling them to fulfil it. The extent to which this result is attained must depend first on the Church's vision of the Truth committed to her, and then on her attitude towards those to whom she has to bear her witness.

There is, I have already emphasized the fact, a real distinction at this present time between the Church and the World. Regarded as rival systems for the ordering of human life, the distinction between them is absolute. The World as World, that is Mankind consciously or unconsciously striving to live its life without God, is and must remain without hope. The system as a system is false and cannot last for ever. God in His love for man cannot suffer it to continue. The Church can only bear witness to the World, in that sense of the term, of its approaching destruction.

But what are we to say of the relation between the members of the human race who at present face each other with these contrasted outlooks? On the side of the World there has certainly been in the past, and we have reason to believe that there will continue to be hatred for the Church and persecution more or less violent for its members. The Church, on the other side, is naturally tempted to clothe itself in its own virtue, to identify its persecutors with the system to which they belong, and so to feel justified in scorning and despising them; and even in exulting at the prospect of the judgment in store for them. The point we have to notice is, that just in so far as the Church has yielded to this temptation and forgotten the fact of its fundamental unity with all mankind, it has failed and failed disastrously in the fulfilment of its function. It has wrought no redemption on the earth. It has repelled men from, instead of attracting them to, the Kingdom of God. It is not merely that it has failed to live up to the full height of a Counsel of Perfection, it has been false to the Truth which lies at the root of its own being. The Church is built on a sacrifice which expresses the Love of God for the whole World.

It exists to bear witness to all men of the fact of their redemption. It knows that its Master Christ is the Logos of Man and of every man, and that the goal set before it is to present every man perfect and complete to Christ, and so to bring the whole race back and up to God in Him. Nothing less than this is the characteristic work of the dispensation in which we live. And here again, at the heart of the Truth in the power of which alone we can take our appointed share in this work, is the fact of our Unity in Christ with the whole race whose nature He shares and for whose life He died.

So deep and so vital are the relations between Truth and Unity as Du Bose perceived and testified. Is it surprising that in the end " Unity," which, after all, is only another name for the Spirit of Love, should have seemed to him to be the sum and substance of the glad tidings of God, with which the Church is entrusted ? Both " Truth " and " Unity " are live issues amongst us to-day. Will it not help us in the discussions which both cannot fail to bring in their train, and which so easily, as we have seen, become embittered and divisive, if we can enter on them with the Vision and the Wisdom of Du Bose ?

CONTENTS

LECTURE I

The Man and His Message

A. *The Background of Spiritual Experience :* (1) The first clear call from God.—(2) His self-consecration after the ruin of his earthly hopes.—(3) The final testing of an enquiring spirit. B. *His Training :* (1) His natural bent towards Plato and St. John complemented by the study of Mathematics, Aristotle and St. Paul.—(2) The stimulus of his work as a University Professor. C. *Personal Characteristics :* (1) His sincerity—" Lieutenant Ninkum Poop."—(2) His independence as a Thinker.—(3) The " Catholicity " of his intellectual sympathies.

LECTURE II

His Vision of Unity and His Confidence in Truth

A. *The Relation of Unity and Truth :* (1) His vision of the Unity of the Kingdom of God as the Truth, *i.e.*, the Key to life and thought. The goal of a lifelong study of Truth at first hand by the method of intuition rather than by discursive reasoning on material supplied by Authority.—(2) His appreciation of " the Polarity of Truth," " a man of both extremes " and of the essential kinship between human reason and the Truth.—(3) This kinship expressed in Christ as the Logos of God, of the Universe, and of Man. B. *Corporate Thinking :* (1) " Christ the Word " reveals the Truth objectively. We apprehend the Truth subjectively for ourselves through the Spirit.—(2) Freedom of search for the individual in spite of its inconveniences and dangers is essential to a vital and growing apprehension of the Truth, which the Church holds corporately.—(3) For as advance in knowledge in every department on the part of the Race comes through individual experience and then is submitted to verification by experts in its own department, so each conclusion, whether of an individual theologian or of a Council, needs corporate verification by the Church as a whole in every place and in every age. C. *The Right Use of Creeds :* (1) The Creeds of

the Church have the authority which attaches to conclusions which have been verified by nearly two thousand years of Christian experience.—(2) We must beware of interfering with this continual process of verification.—(3) The individual accepts the Creed at his baptism on the authority of the Church, and is all his life growing into fuller appreciation of its meaning.—(4) The Truth reached in Christ is at once absolute in itself, and plastic to human apprehension and expression.—(5) Nothing less than the whole Church can grasp and embody the Whole Truth.

LECTURE III

His Method—Spiritual Psychology

A. *Methods Old and New :* The importance of Method. Du Bose by using the living terms of human experience avoids the dangers of the traditional methods of Theological investigation. The Greek metaphysics not materialistic but abstract, and therefore out of touch with reality in the discussion of the Divine and Human Nature of Christ. The Scholastic method deductive, working on material supplied by books rather than by direct observation.—B. *The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible :* For Du Bose the Bible contained in the New Testament Christianity's own first, living and creative, but not mechanically infallible, expression of itself. C. *Holy Scripture as the Universe of Spiritual Science :* The Bible supplies the material for our knowledge of the Spiritual Order as the Visible Universe supplies our material for the knowledge of the Physical Order. D. *The Method of Spiritual Psychology :* Du Bose's method, formed on Aristotle's Ethics, was essentially Psychological, in close touch with modern demands. His study of the Religious Consciousness is distinguished from that of other Psychologists (1) by his use of the Bible as his text-book, and (2) by his analysis of the Religious Consciousness, first of St. Paul and of the other writers of the New Testament, and then of Jesus Himself.

LECTURE IV

Human Need and the Origin of Sin

A. *Human Need :* (1) *" The Soteriology of the New Testament "* is a study of Christianity in the light of its goal, expressed in terms of human experience. As such it provides an introduction to Du Bose's Science of Spiritual Psychology.—(2) In method it is akin to Aristotle's Ethics : but it recognises a spiritual capacity in man

of which Aristotle takes no account. Man's need, therefore, according to Du Bose, is first " Holiness," then " Righteousness," and third " Happiness." And, Man can only attain true self-realization in God.—(3) Du Bose notes three difficulties in the way of self-realization, apart from the complications introduced by sin. They spring (1) from the *vis inertiæ*, (2) from our sensuous nature, (3) from the instinct of self-preservation. There is nothing necessarily sinful in the struggle which is inevitable before these three difficulties can be overcome. B. *The Origin and Nature of Sin:* (1) Dr. Tennant's account of this struggle from the Biological standpoint. He rules out in consequence the traditional conception of " original righteousness " and " original sin," and also Kant's doctrine of the " radical badness " of human nature. He regards sin as an inevitable incident in the evolution of moral character in man.—(2) Du Bose agrees so far that " sin " cannot strictly be predicated of Human Nature. Sin can only originate in a person.—(3) But has Dr. Tennant really accounted for the sense of personal guilt which accompanies failure in the struggle to moralize my human nature? Why does it take the shape of a sense of slavery? Does not this sense coupled with the fact of the solidarity of the evil in the world require us to regard Sin as a personal spiritual power? This solution is not necessarily Manichæan. It does not ascribe to evil a power independent of and co-ordinate with the power of God.—(4) In any case the fact of Sin complicates our original need of Holiness, Righteousness, and the Fulness of Life, with a further need of Atonement, Redemption, and Resurrection.

LECTURE V

Christology in the Light of Soteriology.—I

A. *A New Approach to the Study of the Incarnation:* (1) This analysis of the nature of human salvation throws light on the human side of the problem of Christology. The true and proper deity of Christ is a fundamental postulate. But the deity is only revealed in and through the humanity. And it is only through His humanity that He can bring us the Holiness, Righteousness and Fulness of Life that are our salvation.—(2) This thought revolutionizes our conception of the Incarnation. We have to think of it not only as the birth of deity into a growing humanity which was not perfected till the Ascension and which is still in process of extension through the whole human race. We have to realize that the personal activity of His humanity has a necessary part to play in the process.—(3) It is through this human activity that Christ becomes (1) the

revelation of humanity according to the Divine plan, (2) the way by which (both on the side of the Divine Call and of Human Response) we can attain to our Divine Sonship, and (3) the very substance of our salvation. B. *The Human Nature of Christ under the same Conditions as Ours :* (1) If such be the part that Christ plays in human salvation, He must have fought our battle under our conditions. We cannot therefore ascribe His victory to the fact that the nature that He assumed was sinless while ours is sinful. Du Bose therefore distinguishes " nature " from " personality," and regards " nature " as ethically neutral.—(2) Dr. Tennant makes the same distinction, treating all our inborn faculties as capable of consecration, and ascribing our failure to " nurture." This " nurture " is deeply affected for good and for ill by " social heredity." We are in peril from " the world " as well as from the " flesh."—(3) Still my failure is mine. I have an " ego " distinguishable from my " nature " and my " nurture." And my " radical badness " consists in the fact that I am conscious of an ideal, which I cannot attain in my own strength. My failure when I make the effort is my Fall : but the Fall may become a step upward if it teaches me my need of God.—(4) Du Bose believes with Dr. Tennant that Jesus took a nature like ours in all respects. Only He never tried to act in His own strength. So He used the gift of freedom, which we abuse, to work our deliverance. In Du Bose's phrase, " He took all of ' original sin ' except the sin." He carefully guards the sinlessness of Jesus, and the reality of His Temptations. But neither he nor Dr. Tennant have any use for the Doctrine of " Original Righteousness."

LECTURE VI

Christology in the Light of Soteriology.—II

C. *The Human Personality of Christ.* (a) *The Moral Antinomy involved in its Union with the Divine :* (1) If our Lord's triumph over sin in our nature was not due to any difference between the nature that He assumed and ours, it must be due to a difference in personality. The difference must be compatible with fundamental identity.—(2) As we have to obey away the possibility of disobedience, so must He. This brings us face to face with a moral antinomy, which we cannot resolve. As Man we have to postulate in Him a possibility of disobedience. His Humanity must include the responsibility for moral self-determination. As God this possibility could never become actual. Du Bose refuses, however, *either* to give up the fact of the Incarnation *or* the effort to apprehend it.

(b) *The Development of the Human Personality :* (1) He concentrates on the study of the human side of our Lord's personality. His "Ego" was no doubt Divine. Still in becoming man He accepted the limits by which our human personalities are circumscribed in this life. Within these limits He took His full share in incarnating the Divine Logos.—(2) Since the Ascension He is revealed as at once Human and Divine, as in the Divine thought He has always been. The essential kinship of the Human and the Divine is manifested by the revelation of the Logos as Son.—(3) But the co-operation of His humanity was vital to the manifestation of its essential Divine Sonship. Even His consciousness of the fact, so long as He was on earth, depended on the exercise of His human faculties. C. *His Individuality in its Distinction from Ours :* (1) Consider the steps in the integration of any human personality. A man can only become his true self by the surrender of his will to the guidance of the Spirit of God, *i.e.*, by the sacrifice of his individuality. We attain this integration in Jesus Christ by incarnating His Divine-Human personality, losing ourselves to find ourselves in Him.—(2) Jesus Christ was subject to the same law as regards the integration of His Human Personality. He continually sacrificed His Human Individuality. He refused to have any will of His own independent of His Father. Continually emptying out "self," He was continually full of the Spirit: and so perfectly embodied God's Word and Thought of Himself and of all mankind. This achievement constitutes His distinctive characteristic among men, *i.e.*, it is His Individuality.—(3) We can see therefore that there is nothing unhuman, there is the perfection of humanity in this power to overcome all the temptations that are appointed for man, *i.e.*, in the moral impossibility of sinning which differentiates Him from all other men.

LECTURE VII

Christology in the Light of Soteriology.—III

D. *The Hypostatic Union as a Fact.* (a) *The Physical and Metaphysical Antinomies :* (1) Besides the Moral Antinomy, there are Physical and Metaphysical Antinomies involved in the "Hypostatic Union," *i.e.*, the Union of the Divine and the Human Nature in Christ. The first step towards a re-solution of these Antinomies is provided by recognizing in the Incarnation the third stage in a progressive Divine Self-limitation.—(2) Is the recognition of a distinction between "spiritual" and "Physical" elements or attributes in the Godhead a second step? Does not this imply a partial Incarnation of the Logos? What knowledge have we of

the Divine Nature and Attributes apart from their manifestation in Jesus Christ? Does He not now in His Humanity share the Divine qualities of Omniscience, Omnipotence, Omnipresence? Is any fresh difficulty involved in a Divine self-limitation in the manifestation of these qualities "in the days of His flesh," over and above the Divine self-limitation in the exercise of the Divine Holiness, which was implied in submitting to the discipline of Temptation? (b) *The Antinomies resolved by a New Line of Approach:* (1) Our study of Soteriology has helped us to realize the union of the Divine and Human in Jesus Christ as a fact. We have examined the Moral and the Metaphysical difficulties involved in the conception of this union, and though we have not solved them, we have seen reason to justify us in keeping the door open for further investigation.—(2) It is possible that further study of the subliminal, the sub-conscious and the unconscious may support the hypothesis of the presence of latent faculties in His Human Nature. This would not, however, affect the difficulty from the Divine side.—(3) A more hopeful method for the solution of the difficulty is supplied by Dr. Mackintosh. The antinomies are due to the effort to solve a vital problem in the abstract and unreal terms of Metaphysics.—(4) Dr. Forsyth, realizing this, approaches the problem from the side of personality. He finds the divine and the human interlocked in every part of the human experience of the divine. This interlocking implies an inner distinction within the absolute God.—(5) Du Bose in *The Reason of Life* reached the same conclusion. Approached from this side the human is seen in its essential kinship to the Divine. All our life is inter-penetrated by this Hypostatic Union.

LECTURE VIII

The Doctrine of God and of the Church

A. *God in Creation, Immanent and Transcendent:* (1) According to Du Bose the doctrine of the Logos marks a distinction in our apprehension between God as in Himself Transcendent and God as Immanent in Creation.—(2) The conception of the Logos as God immanent in Creation is in striking harmony with Bergson's conception of the force which is attaining to an ever fuller expression of itself by Creative Evolution. Compare McDowall in *Evolution and the Trinity*.—(3) Du Bose is also in striking accord with McDowall in his conception of the interaction of the Divine and the human in the spiritual evolution of Man. B. *God in Incarnation Manifested in the Holy Trinity:* (1) The relation of God to man

manifested in the Incarnation is a " Transcendent " relation. This relation is manifested to and through human apprehension in Jesus Christ. As St. John meditated on his experience he found that the Human life of Jesus had been to the Apostles a manifestation in time of the eternal Communion of the Father and the Son in the Holy Spirit.—(2) The vision of God given us in the Gospel is determined not by abstract metaphysical speculation, but by the personal relation in which we stand to Him as working upon us by His Word and within us by His Spirit. This vision is Trinitarian through and through. Love in the Father becomes Divine Self-communication in the Son, and Human participation in the Divine in the Holy Ghost in whom God and man are being made one. C. *The Church as an Extension of the Incarnation :* (1) On one side the Church is in process of evolution in relation to its Divine Environment in response to the revelation of God as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The Church is at the same time growing to its perfection as the Body of Christ. Its evolution is therefore continually determined by its relation to the humanity of Jesus Christ.—(2) The Jesus of History is true man. But as revealed in the experience of the Church He is more than " a man." As we have seen in our study of Soteriology we only find ourselves as we yield ourselves to His identity. His personality includes and constitutes ours. He is MAN.—(3) As united to Him, and to one another in Him, the Church as His Body is the Sacrament of His abiding presence among men, and the instrument for the extension of His Incarnation until the whole race is in Him brought home to God. This is the goal of Du Bose's Vision of Unity, and the secret of its consecrating power.

DU BOSE AS A PROPHET OF UNITY

LECTURE I

THE MAN AND HIS MESSAGE

The Background of Spiritual Experience

When "God spake in old times to our Fathers through the prophets," the relation between the men and the message with which they were charged was vital and personal. It is always so. On all subjects but the most abstract, if we could comprehend a man's thought we must set it in its context in the life of the man, and in the life of his time. We are yet hardly far enough away from Dr. Du Bose to see the relation of his thought to the thought of his time. We can, however, by the help of his singularly illuminating autobiography, *Turning Points in My Life*, set it in the light of his spiritual experience.

In this experience there are three outstanding moments. The first of these was the crisis of his spiritual awakening, "the vision of Glory," which, to use a phrase of Dr. Westcott's, was "the prophet's call."

The story can be told only in his own words:

"Three cadets, returning from a long march and series of encampments, and a brief stoppage at their

common home, spent, on their way back to their garrison, a night in a certain city, and returned at midnight hilarious and weary from what was called a 'roaring farce' at the little theatre, to occupy one bed at the crowded hotel. In a moment the others were in bed and asleep. There was no apparent reason why I should not have been so, too, or why it should just then have occurred to me that I had not of late been saying my prayers. Perfectly unconscious and unsuspicious of anything unusual, I knelt to go through the form, when of a sudden there swept over me a feeling of the emptiness and unmeaningness of the act and of my whole life and self. I leapt to my feet trembling, and then that happened which I can only describe by saying that a light shone about me and a Presence filled the room. At the same time an ineffable joy and peace took possession of me which it is impossible either to express or explain. I continued, I know not how long, perfectly conscious of, simply but intensely feeling the Presence, and fearful, by any movement, of breaking the spell. I went to sleep at last praying that it was no passing illusion, but that I should awake to find it an abiding reality" (*Turning Points*, pp. 18 f).

This crisis came to a lad of twenty, brought up "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," who had never been without spiritual susceptibility, but who had for the time fallen asleep at his post.

The essential soundness of his inner being stands revealed by the instantaneous, instinctive, wholehearted response that he made to the first whisper of his Father's Voice, when "God and nature met in Light" in him. In the deepest and truest sense he found and knew that he found himself in finding God.

The "natural" divine Sonship in him passed by an intensely real but almost passionless crisis into the spiritual, which was for him in all his thinking always pre-eminently the higher natural. As he grew in knowledge and experience in the course of a lifelong walk with God, he became more and more conscious of the necessity for a continual dying to sin. But the transition with him left behind it no scars of moral conflict with a consciously rebellious will. The new life does not stand out for him as it does in so many theological systems, against a background dark with the terrors of the wrath of God. His vision of the content of salvation is not the less piercing because in this respect his spiritual kinship is with St. John rather than with St. Augustine or St. Paul. The outward rapture faded, as was to be expected, into the light of common day, leaving the young Du Bose with no further token of the experience through which he had passed than "a sensitised and transfigured—not only consciousness but —conscience." Its presence and its power, however, never left him. It gave him a conviction of spiritual reality which the ruin of his outward hopes could only intensify, and all the questionings of a reason resolutely sceptical were unable to disturb. To use the words of another great religious thinker, Horace Bushnell, whose experience in this and other respects has many points of contact with his own, "A Being so profoundly felt must inevitably be."*

The trial, however, to which his faith was subjected was fiery enough. It will be well at this stage to stay awhile and take note of it. We have a record in his own words of two outstanding crises in it. He is speaking of the night about ten years after his conver-

* See Appendix A.

sion when he first faced the possibility of final defeat for the Confederate cause.

"The actual issue was all upon me that fateful night in which, under the stars, alone upon the planet, without home or country or any earthly interest or object before me, my very world at an end, I re-devoted myself wholly and only to God, and to the work and life of His Kingdom, whatever and wherever that might be."

The other came when we might least have expected it, just fifty years later, in his eightieth year. It is, of course, no isolated experience. It is the final crisis of what must have been the life-long testing of his resolutely enquiring spirit. He wrote to his friend and pupil, Silas McBee:

"In a sense this eightieth year of my life has been one of worse than European war between me and old age. In this I feel that I can say modestly that I have conquered. It is not only old age I have had to contend with, but a number of external conditions . . . and hindrances, which have broken up, paralyzed, and dissipated my natural energies; but all that does not touch the real root of my troubles; it has only had the beneficent effect, as most certainly the gracious purpose, of throwing me back upon a re-examination and a deeper questioning and testing of my religion. I have gone deeper into it, and reached higher than ever before, and I humbly believe I can say now, 'I not only believe but know.' At any rate, I have discovered that the more persistently and perseveringly one believes to the bitterest end, the more certainly one knows, and is grateful for having been spared none of the tests. I have been just as much higher up this summer as I

have been deeper down. My costliest failure has been converted into the completest success. I have nothing to show, but I am firmer on the rock" (*Constructive Quarterly*, VIII, 513).

Such is the background of spiritual experience, in the light of which we have to read Du Bose's contribution to the thought of his time and of ours. But before we come to consider that in detail, it will be well to spend a little further time on his training as a thinker, and on some of his characteristics as a man.

His Training and His Characteristics as a Thinker

Du Bose entered the Military Academy at Charleston, S.C., at the age of sixteen, the choice of school being decided, we are told, by the fact that he seemed to be deficient in mathematical ability. He passed out, the head of his year, in 1855. The story illustrates a constant element in his training which, partly by what we call accident, but in great measure of deliberate purpose, set the stamp of balance and completeness upon his development. By nature eminently lovable, simple, in the true sense childlike, he had to serve a hard apprenticeship in the school of war before he settled down to his life's work as a university professor. His deepest spiritual and intellectual affinities were with the mystics and the idealists—with Plato and with St. John. The exigencies of controversy with a classmate over the five points of Calvinism gave St. Paul a predominant influence in his theological thinking. His work as a Professor of Ethics wedded him to Aristotle.

In all this it might have seemed as if personal choice had little to do with the form that his training assumed.

In one of his latest essays on "The Subjective and Objective in Religion" he tells us that he deliberately let his natural bent towards the evangelical and subjective take care of itself to develop the Catholic and objective, so that at least he must have accepted this overruling *con amore*.

His chief debt, no doubt, was to the constant stimulus of his work as a university professor. Superficially, Sewanee would not seem a promising training ground for a thinker with a world-wide horizon. He had only a small class of immature students in a struggling university that had to be re-created out of ruin.

Yet there is nothing pedantic, nothing provincial, about the thoughts that came to him there. In fact, where the man is alive, there is no post so stimulating as that of a teacher in a university centre. In England, at least, all of our great religious movements have sprung from our ancient universities. Our leading theologians of the nineteenth century, almost without exception, were university professors. Constant contact with young minds, facing the problems of life while they are still fresh and insistent, is a powerful mental tonic. Even amid the growing pressure of administrative detail a man, if he will, can still, in a university like Sewanee, or in a theological seminary like those which it has been my privilege to visit in America, find leisure to think as well as to read.

What teaching meant for Du Bose is revealed all the more effectually, because unconsciously, in his autobiography. The master, seated in his accustomed chair, with representatives of thirty-five generations of pupils before him, asks himself this one question: "What has life given me? What has life given me that I have taken, and that I have, that I may give

you if you will take it ? " He will teach only what he knows at first hand ; he will testify what he has seen for himself and his hands have handled, of the Word of Life.

When heart thus speaks to heart, it is not surprising that there should be something in the utterance for all the world to hear.

In the truest sense, in Du Bose's case, the man was the message. We may pass on, then, to consider three personal characteristics. Let us take first his sincerity. In this connection there is a deep moral in a story which he tells against himself :

" I remember, just at that period, a singularly trifling incident which, nevertheless, in its effect has been present with me as an actual force for fifty years. What a very little spark may kindle the most destructive conflagration, or sometimes the most illuminating and beneficent flame ! In this case so ridiculous a suggestion could not have awakened so lasting a train of thought and consequence, if the occasion and material had not been ripe and ready for it. In an idle moment I chanced to pick up an old magazine in which were narrated the military experiences and exploits of a certain Lieutenant Poop. His Christian name was Ninkum—Mr. Ninkum Poop. First, in most descriptive and expressive terms, were elaborated and described the heroically high and noble ideals and sentiments with which the newly-fledged lieutenant devoted himself to the sacred service of his country, the great British Empire. What aspirations, what hopes and expectations and high-wrought purposes, what dreams and visions of self-sacrifice, and then of honour and greatness and glory ! Lieutenant Ninkum Poop arrives

at the seat of war, where all his ideas are to be put into action and all his sentiments to be converted into conduct and character and achievement. He goes through it all, his thoughts and expressions to the end swelling with the magnanimity of the great-souled, his actions, on the contrary, evincing only the pusillanimity of the little-souled, the coward, and the poltroon.

"I would not tell this simply as the undignified illustration of a principle: I give it as a historical life-moment and life movement in my spiritual history. That arrow went home and still rankles in my breast. I cannot tell how often I have found and called myself a Ninkum Poop; how often, in very other terms, I have preached the fact it illustrates to myself and others: that life is not life as long as it is only in the mind, or even in the heart; that it is only life when it has been converted into life. Christianity has only begun when it begins to live what it believes and what it feels: 'If ye know these things, blessed are you if ye do them.' Have we a Christianity that does what it says, that practises what it preaches? What we want is not to have a new Christianity, but to have a new way of having Christianity: a new way which is the old one, the way of Him who was, and still is, the Way. He is not alone in Himself the truth and the life, but no less the way to us of really knowing the truth and living the life" (*Turning Points*, pp. 28 ff).

There is none who had less need, as the outsider would judge, of a warning against the "besetting sin of speculative thought—empty idealism." But it takes a true man to appreciate the dangers of unreality. Du Bose knew them, and has warned us against them as St. Thomas à Kempis has done.

"Let not Moses, therefore, speak unto me, but Thou, O Lord my God, the everlasting Truth, lest I die and prove unfruitful, if I be only warned outwardly, and not inflamed within. Lest it turn to my condemnation—the Word—heard and not fulfilled, known and not loved, believed and not observed."

And again:

"How much the more thou knowest and how much the better thou understandest, so much the more severely shalt thou on that account be judged, unless thy life be also the more holy."

The Truth Himself has bidden us take heed that we build not on the sand but on the rock.

Closely akin to this intense sincerity is the fearless independence of the man, and especially of the thinker. He was, as he tells us himself, a man who made great use of very few books, resembling in this respect one of the great formative influences in the thought of Oxford in the "'Seventies," Professor T. H. Green. He was fortunately free from the entanglements of "Confessions" and "Platforms."

The thirty-nine Articles may have many defects. It is fashionable just now to decry them. But at least they make no pretence to be a complete and rigid theological system. They leave a man free, within very wide limits, to think for himself. So Du Bose drew his theology without let or hindrance from its fountain head in the New Testament, primarily from St. Paul and not from the "Systematizers"; and in his study of humanity he worked continuously on the great pioneer text-book of moral psychology by "the Master of those that know," the *Nicomachean Ethics*

of Aristotle. The power of that book over him, and its efficiency in his hands as an instrument of education, is a remarkable testimony to the vital potency of the work of a genuine thinker for all time.

I have already called attention to the fact that in the Divine ordering, the text-books of this essentially mystical teacher were Aristotle and St. Paul rather than Plato and St. John. His appreciation of poetry—the poets representing the search of the soul of man after God while the prophets express the Divine condescension to human need—is not surprising. His favourite poet was Tennyson. The influence of the *In Memoriam*, especially of the Prologue, can be traced in his writing to the end.

His main interest, however, from first to last, lay not in books but in the hearts of men, his own and his pupils'. This kept him in sensitive touch with all the movements of thought in his time. Look, for instance, at the opening chapter of *The Reason of Life*. Notice the range of interests included in it; national and international, social and industrial; but above all, in religion and philosophy, the relation of religion and science, the conflict between immanence and transcendence, idealism and pragmatism, and the modernist controversy over the merely human divinity or the real Deity of the Person of Jesus Christ.

He claimed with justice at the end of his life to be in full sympathy with the modern mind. I have noted, therefore, "comprehensiveness" as the third of his mental characteristics.

Comprehensiveness may be, as Coleridge teaches us, of two kinds, exemplified by Shakespeare and Milton respectively. "While Shakespeare darts himself forth and passes into all the forms of human character and

passion, the one Proteus of the fire and the flood, Milton attracts all forms and things to himself into the unity of his own ideal. All things and modes of action shape themselves anew in the being of Milton; while Shakespeare becomes all things, yet for ever remaining himself."

If so, there is no doubt that Du Bose's comprehensiveness is of the Miltonic type; or rather, he embodied with singular completeness the ideal of St. Thomas à Kempis: "To him all things were one; he traced all things back to one, and saw all things in one."

Yet he was always on the watch, as we have seen, against the danger of being one-sided, taking special pains to develop those elements of his nature in which he felt himself least responsive to the truth.

His natural bent, indeed, as he rightly asserted, was as profoundly sceptical as that of many of his most distinguished Victorian contemporaries. He shared their intense belief in law and even their somewhat mechanical conception of uniformity, so that it was only the depth and intensity of his own spiritual experience, and his clear grasp of the spiritual realities of the Incarnation and the Resurrection, that prevented his being carried away by their influence. This did not imply any indifference to the sovereign claims of truth. Only he felt that "the freest mind is that which is open alike to the claims of the natural and the spiritual in us, not to either as against the other." And again he had learned to hold his mind in suspense "upon matters which we have eternity in which to know, and to know which eternity will not be too long" (*Turning Points*, p. 93).

We may fairly, therefore, claim comprehensiveness no less than sincerity and independence, as characteristic

of his thinking. Indeed, even comprehensiveness seems too narrow a word. His comprehensiveness was all inclusive, "catholic" in the widest sense of the word. He viewed life steadily, and alike as an ideal and as an achievement we may fairly claim that he viewed it whole.

LECTURE II

HIS MESSAGE AND ITS FOUNDATION—CONFIDENCE IN TRUTH

A. Unity and Truth

We have considered the spiritual background of Du Bose's thinking; his training on the battlefield and in the lecture-room; his sincerity, his independence and the breadth or rather the catholicity of his intellectual sympathies. Such being the man, what was his message? In brief, it was the sovereign claim of Unity as the master-key to all the problems of spiritual life and thought. This conviction was implicit in his thinking from the beginning. It came into clear expression in the opening chapter of *The Reason of Life* (p. 9):

"The Kingdom of God is nothing if it is not organized and ordered unity—unity with God and unity in God, unity of spirit, of law, of life. And the Church of God is no living thing if it is not something more than human organization—the divine organism and organ of unity human and divine. Unity is absolutely the first and the one thing. What is Love but oneness with God and with all else in Him? The Church is first 'One,' and then, and therefore, 'Holy': for what is holiness but the spirit of unity and love? Thus, next, it is 'Catholic,' for catholicity or universality is the necessary corollary of unity. And finally it is 'Apostolic,' simply because that which is one must be so in

sequence or time, as well as in extension or space—from beginning to end, as well as from end to end. In no less truth than this is the Church the Kingdom of God, the Body of Christ, or the Temple of the Holy Ghost."

There can be no doubt as to the originality and freshness of this vision of the essential unity of the Kingdom: nor as to its significance as a contribution to the cause of Christian Re-union. It has already borne rich and abiding fruit in the ten volumes of the *Constructive Quarterly*, in which Dr. Silas McBee, the most loyal and ardent of disciples, has demonstrated the practical value of his master's ideal. He has shown that it is possible for the keenest members of all our divided communions to meet on a common platform and realize their fellowship with all their brethren in the "Great Church," if they will be content, laying aside for the time all thought of controversy, to bear each his own witness to that portion of the Truth which it has been given to them to apprehend. For, if Du Bose is right, there can be no conflict between the claims of Truth and the claims of Unity. If the truth is that we are one, it is only as we "live the truth in love that we can hope to attain to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."

In any case, Du Bose was not sacrificing the sovereign claims of Truth in the interests of a spurious charity. Unity was the goal and not the starting point of his thinking. He had early taken to heart the motto of Bishop Butler's *Analogy*. "Things are as they are, and the consequences will be what they will be." His whole life was spent in an unwearying search for Truth, inspired by a serene confidence in its power to

vindicate itself to the minds of men without any adventitious support.

Look, for instance, at the opening paragraph of his *Soteriology :*

" What Salvation means and specifically what *our* Salvation means is a matter primarily determined not by creeds, not by Scripture, not by divine revelation, but by the facts of our own nature and condition."

And again in the opening article of the *Constructive Quarterly*, March 1913, p. 5 :

" Christianity *is* and is what it is. I cannot conceive it as at this late day either needing to be or capable of being ' made ' or ' made over.' "

The fact is, in his view, the centre and ground of our agreement ; our disagreements come from the inevitable variety of our constructions.

It is clear, therefore, that to him, as to Henri Bergson, the ultimate appeal is to intuition and to experience rather than to the discursive reason. For him, as for Dr. Hort, it is only the lower class of truths that can in any strict sense be proved or disproved.*

" Such persistent beliefs as that in God, or in freedom, or immortality, are not believed because they have been or can be proved : they are forever seeking to be proved, because they are believed " (*The Gospel in the Gospels,* p. 206).

" I think we should cease from trying to prove the unprovable, and take to knowing the entirely knowable fact that the universe in which we are is a personal universe " (*The Gospel according to St. Paul,* p. 238).

* See Appendix B.

He had a strong conviction that the difficulties of logic could only be solved in life. A striking headline in *The Ecumenical Councils* (p. 21) asserts that "Truth is polar." As the positive and the negative currents of electricity are combined in an indissoluble unity in every magnet so, he would suggest, in all the antinomies that result from the co-existence of the finite and the infinite, of which the relation of the human and the divine in the person of Jesus Christ is at once the climax and the solution, the truth demands not the surrender of either element, but the resolute assertion of both in a perfectly real and harmonious synthesis. He was therefore never afraid of asserting that there are "contraries which do not contradict." He was emphatically, like Charles Simeon, the great leader of the Evangelical movement in England, a man of "both extremes."*

At the same time he was deeply convinced of the power of Truth to verify itself to human reason:

"Ultimately we know things because they are true. We love things because they are good. We do things because they are right. The mind for truth, the heart for love, the will for right. Each of these pairs are in the world for each other, testing each other, finding themselves in the other. As they come together the world of the Spirit is fashioned out of our struggles and failures. The spiritual things verify themselves to the spiritual man" (*Constructive Quarterly*, VI., 579 condensed).

It is interesting to note in passing the fundamental harmony of this position with that which Professor Pringle-Pattison reaches independently from a different point of view.

* See Appendix C.

"There is no explanation possible of the evolution of sense-organs and of the sentient organism generally, unless we assume the reality of the new features of the world to which that evolution introduces us. The organism is developed and its powers perfected as an instrument of nature's purpose of self-revelation" (*The Idea of God*, p. 127).

"All idealism teaches the correlativity of subject and object; they develop *pari passu* keeping step together, inasmuch as the objective world seems to grow in richness as we develop faculties to apprehend it" (*ibid*, p. 129).

Du Bose applies this thought *con amore* as a key both to the life of Christ and to His place in the work of human salvation:

"What did Christ believe in, become obedient to, sacrifice Himself for? He believed in the Truth, *i.e.*, the Good. Human Good is the natural, rational, and free want and wish and will of all, and is in the true self of each. Yet it is hard to believe in the good, to live and die for it, to give yourself for it. But this is what our Lord did. He believed in it, the underlying will to good in the Universe. The reason, meaning, end and purpose of it all. Our Lord speaks of *It* as Father, not only believing in, but obeying Him. So living His Faith to the uttermost" (*Constructive Quarterly*, V. 209 ff. condensed).

And again:

"Instinct and object are correlative. The drawing of God to man and of man to God is as natural as the mutual attraction of the infant and the breast. Jesus

Christ has part in both sides of the drawing" (*Constructive Quarterly*, Dec. 1917).

Closely connected with this, as we shall have to notice more at length in the closing lecture, is Du Bose's delight in the doctrine of the Logos. Jesus Christ is God's Truth and Word to every man of himself. He is primarily the Logos of Man. Further He is the Logos of Creation. The natural and the supernatural world or order are not two but one in Him. There is but one thought and purpose in all. The natural evolution comes to itself in man, and man comes to himself in Christ (cf. *Ecumenical Councils*, pp. 85–89).

B. Corporate Thinking and Creeds

Du Bose was conscious that his faith in the doctrine of the Logos was not as yet the faith of all. The modern mind is somehow more receptive of the Spirit than of the Word of God. It responds more readily to an appeal through the heart than through the head. He felt the danger of this. For we need an objective Revelation to balance a subjective Inspiration. Mankind is united through the Spirit to the Word. Yet he was a whole-hearted advocate of the freedom of the Spirit in the search of Truth. He pleads earnestly in his paper on "Liberty and Authority in Christian Thought" (*Turning Points*, c. VII) for a real tolerance on the part of the Church "of the utmost liberty and diversity, the always possible and often actual mistakes and contradictions of her most originally and energetically thinking and living members," on the ground that the attempt to restrict freedom of thought must be fatal to the acquisition alike of a living faith and of spiritual unity.

He was always, as *The Gospel in the Gospels* shows, more ready to welcome the element of truth in a position, with which as a whole he disagreed, than to denounce its deficiencies. He was sure that a generous policy of inclusion would justify itself in practical working:

"Extremes will reconcile themselves, and will work themselves out, lose their sting, and leave their contribution if recognized and recognizing their common right within the Church; while if driven out, or if each claims only its own exclusive right within the Church, the thing emphasized and developed will be only their difference and not their unity" (*Turning Points*, p. 127).

This did not mean, however, that he was an advocate of the unrestricted right of private judgment: or that he had no use for the authority of the Bible and of the Church.

He believed indeed that the ultimate appeal is to a spiritual faculty present, though as yet it may be latent in each individual:

"Spiritual truth passes through individual experience into the possession of all."

"Catholic truths are simply individual apprehensions of spiritual truths, which have won their way to general acceptance. Just as many natural truths have found their way into the universal reason of mankind" (cf. *Ecumenical Councils*, pp. 41–44).

"Nothing in this world, not even the Church, is in an absolute sense infallible and irreformable. . . . There is nothing theoretically or actually impossible in an Athanasius in the right, *contra mundum* or *contra ecclesiam*" (*Turning Points*, pp. 137 f).

This possibility of advance through individual initiative is the one condition of growth in knowledge for the race. Yet he believed, as wholeheartedly as Professor Royce, that all advance in truth is by a corporate process. No individual conclusion in any branch of science has any authority until it has been tested and approved by those who are competent to judge in its own department. Similarly no decision of a Church Council has any validity until it has been tested by the common or universal experience of the whole Christian Church. " It can only be ascertained that the verdict is true, and will stand, by a long and silent process through which the decision is referred back to the Church again to say whether it has correctly expressed itself through its council " (*Ecumenical Councils*, p. 46).

For " Spirit is essentially social. When we think in the spirit we do so collectively " (*Constructive Quarterly*, vi. 579 f. condensed).

" The goal, and the ultimate criterion [of faith] is not in the mind and will of one, but in the intelligent consent of all " (*Turning Points*, p. 73).

He was convinced, therefore, that there exists to-day a definite body or system of Catholic truth :

" Nearly two thousand years of Christian experience have not passed without settling, determining, and establishing anything, without accumulating and consolidating a body of verified facts, of common sense and general consent, in the world of the spiritual any more than of the natural. I make no more and no less claim for spiritual than for natural or scientific dogma, that has passed into common consent, and become part of

our common sense. The Church would stultify itself if down to the present it claimed nothing as essential, necessary and determined in Christianity" (*Turning Points*, p. 134).

Du Bose never, so far as I know, discusses the question where an enquirer may find this definite system of Catholic truth. For him no doubt it found sufficient expression in the "Nicene" and in the Apostles' Creed.

At the same time he strove earnestly to reassure the authorities of the Church who were trembling for the safety of the Ark of God. He would inspire them, if possible, with his own conviction that the truth, which won consent in the past after the freest discussion, has nothing to fear from the unrestrained criticism of the present. It can safely be trusted to defend itself, if the field is left open.

This is surely courageous and timely counsel. Perhaps even more illuminating is the illustration that he gives from his own experience of the true place and purpose of the Creed of the Church in the development of individual faith.

"The articles of the Creed may properly be required to be repeated for entrance into the Church, but only so as they are outwardly confessed and accepted as being the historic, organic, and developed faith of the Church, and assuredly not as all digested, assimilated, and converted into the actual life of the incipient member. In other words, there is a great deal which we may outwardly confess as *the faith*, which we rightly hold on the reasonable external authority of corporate and historical Christianity, which nevertheless to be compelled to profess, as in its totality our personal subjective actual and attained faith, would simply

involve us in either self-deception or hypocrisy" (*Turning Points*, p. 23).

And again:

"I have all my life been coming to what of truth I hold, and there is truth to which I have all my life been coming, to which I have not yet come. All the truth of the Church is not yet mine: there are points of it that I know to be true, because I have been all the time approximating to them; but I am still waiting, and shall probably die waiting for them to become true to me. Truth is not an individual thing; no one of us has all of it—even all of it that is known. Truth is a corporate possession, and the knowledge of it is a corporate process. It enters slowly and painfully into the common sense, the common experience, the common use and life of man. There is a corporate, catholic Christianity, actually extant on the earth, which no one or no set of us holds all of, or perfectly even what we do hold. Christianity, even so far as actualized in the world, is more and greater than any one or any body of us, and the full actualization of Christianity will come only with the fruition of the world's destiny, in the end of the ages" (*Turning Points*, pp. 55 f).

These words surely ring true. And does not this example prove the abiding value of our rich inheritance in the Church's Creed? There can be no suspicion of unreality in such an acceptance of the time-honoured "Rule of Faith," which has been submitted continually to fresh verification in the living experience of each succeeding generation, as the sum of Truth so far attained by the society to which we belong.

Is it not our wisdom to reverence it, as Du Bose did,

as an ideal, and to wait patiently as he waited, while it little by little manifests itself anew to us in all its fulness? The Truth, the whole Truth, this at least we know, whatever may be our judgment with regard to any form of human words in which it has as yet found expression, is ours in Christ. This is Truth, absolute, and yet in our apprehension of it it is continuously plastic, with an infinite capacity for growth to keep pace with each step in the growth of our power to apprehend it, not only individually but corporately. For it is only " in company with all the saints that we can hope to apprehend the length and breadth and depth and height, and know the love that passeth knowledge." Nothing short of the whole Church, when it has gathered in the whole race, can grasp and embody the whole Truth.

LECTURE III

HIS METHOD—SPIRITUAL PSYCHOLOGY

A. Methods Old and New

We have seen the foundation of Du Bose's witness to and striving after Unity in his vision of the Truth. We have seen, further, how in all his thinking he kept in the closest touch with life and reality. We have to consider now the characteristics of his method of apprehending and expounding it. This should bring us very near to the heart of our subject. Success or failure in the solution of any problem depends on nothing so much as on the way in which it is approached. The genius which advances knowledge in any direction is shown even more in the selection of the appropriate method than in any amount of skill and perseverance in its application.

In Du Bose's case the method was so simple and spontaneous—with him in the deepest sense "the method was the man"—that we may find ourselves asking whether he had any method at all. His own account of the matter is just this: "I presented Christ and Christianity at first hand, not in the letter but in the spirit, not in traditional or conventional forms of technical language, but in living terms of actual human relation and experience" (*Turning Points*, p. 44).

It sounds simple enough when stated so. It is just the ideal which we should wish our teachers of Theology always to keep before them. A man with that ideal

before him will be forced in all his teaching to keep in closest touch with life and reality. It will keep him clear from the pitfalls that beset the path alike of the Greek metaphysician and of the Latin Scholastic.

In saying this we are under no necessity to disparage the contribution either of the Greek or of the Latin Church to the understanding of the fact of Christ. In abstract thought the Greeks have been and no doubt will remain our masters to the end of time. It was not for nothing that the fact of Christ was for five centuries subject to critical analysis in the light of the clearest thinking that the world has known. There is singularly little justification for the complaint that the Gospel was corrupted by being "Hellenized." There is, of course, "metaphysics" in a single clause in the "Nicene" Creed, the clause in which we declare that the One Lord Jesus Christ is of "one substance" with the Father. But it would seem about as reasonable to say that the Platonic doctrine of substance was "materialistic" as to bring that charge against the whole of Greek Theology.

At the same time Greek philosophy has the defects of its qualities. The method of metaphysics is a method of abstraction. When we forget that fact, in philosophy, we need a Bergson to remind us that every step that we take towards greater precision in recording and communicating the impressions that we receive from the growing universe to which we belong is a step away from reality: and, when we forget the same fact in theology, we find that, as Dr. Mackintosh puts it, "The doctrine of the two natures, if taken seriously, gives us two abstractions instead of one reality, two impotent halves in place of one living whole. It hypostatizes falsely two *aspects* of a single concrete

life—aspects which are so indubitably real that apart from either the whole fact would be quite other than it is" (*The Person of Jesus Christ*, p. 295).

It is hard to remember that we ought never to have regarded the term "nature," whether "human" or "divine," in such a definition as anything other than an "abstraction." It is just the "metaphysical" way of expressing a distinct aspect of a living reality. If we are to take the doctrine seriously we must make allowance for that fact. Or, in other words, if we are to get behind our analytical representation of the fact, we must approach it by some other way than that of the analytical understanding.*

Du Bose's criticism of the failure of Greek Theology takes a different form, but it amounts in the end to the same thing. "Its primary lack," he says, "was that of the as yet undeveloped capacity to apply to its facts a proper scientific or inductive method" (*Ecumenical Councils*, p. 322). It was *a priori* or deductive, *i.e.*, it argued from its own definitions as if they were themselves the realities with which we have to deal. In any case, Du Bose struggling to bring his pupils into contact with spiritual realities was in no danger of mistaking abstractions for substantialities, or of trying to combine them in unspiritual modes.

He was delivered also from the besetting danger of Scholasticism. The Schoolman started, as we shall see that Du Bose started, from Holy Scripture, and he set himself to fashion its teaching into a coherent whole in the light of the philosophy of Aristotle, and of the writings of accredited fathers. This is an entirely worthy object, and no one can contemplate the Summa

* See Appendix D.

of St. Thomas Aquinas without deep awe. But concentration of attention on the text of written authorities may take our minds away from the observation of the living fact, no less fatally than preoccupation with the letter of our own definitions. Martin Luther, in one way, and Francis Bacon in another were needed to break the fetters of Scholasticism. We cannot now dwell on the causes which led straight from Martin Luther's appeal to the Bible as the fount and test of spiritual experience to the establishment of a period of Protestant Scholasticism, which has issued in the modern revolt against the Religions of Authority in favour of the Religion of the Spirit. My immediate point is that Du Bose's pupils were in no danger of supposing that reverence for the authority of the Bible and of the Church absolved them from the obligation of striving after a first-hand acquaintance with the Truth.

B. The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible

I have already dealt with Du Bose's attitude towards the authority of the Church in considering the conditions of corporate thinking and the use of the Creeds. It will be well to say something with regard to his conception of the inspiration and authority of the Bible before attempting to find a term by which to characterize more precisely his method as a whole.

There is no doubt that the New Testament was in the strictest sense Du Bose's text-book. From it he learnt, and out of it he taught what Christ and Christianity are.

In doing so, he showed no desire to shield the

Bible from criticism or to claim for it any mechanical infallibility :

" There is no question that the case has been made out for the very humanness and fallibility of the Scriptures as of the Church. Is their divine origin and authority gone with it ? I confess that the Scriptures are more divine to me now than they ever were before ; that I was never more a believer in their inspiration. If there has ever been anything in all my life verified by actual experience, it has been the divinity of the New Testament, after all that criticism has done with it " (*Turning Points*, p. 91).

In regard to its inspiration he writes :

" All that is necessary is that those who were nearest to Him in time and space should have so known our Lord as it was essential that He should be known, if He was to be any revelation at all of God and of human salvation, and that they should have so recorded and transmitted their knowledge of Him that it should continue to be the possession of the Church after them " (*Ecumenical Councils*, p. 39).

This view of the inspiration of Holy Scripture corresponds with his view of the principle that was implied in the formation of the Canon :

" The action of the Church in accepting a Canon of Scripture need not have been more than the instinctive and practical wisdom of receiving as highest, truest and best Christianity's own first, living and creative expression of itself, and making this the norm and measure of all subsequent self-expressions of it. It is self-evident to the mind that takes it in as a whole

that the New Testament is a single movement of spiritual and Christian thought and life and that it is complete and sufficient in itself. It is equally certain that neither the succeeding nor any subsequent age had in it either the plastic capacity or the creative power to take for itself a living form such as Christianity easily, freely and naturally assumed in its initiative stage. And, therefore, it was, to say no more, an act of practical wisdom to accept that first embodiment and expression of itself as in principle at least and in substance final and irreformable" (*Ecumenical Councils*, p. 25).

C. Holy Scripture as the Universe of Spiritual Science

We have seen that the value of the New Testament lay for Du Bose in the fact that it contains a complete expression of Christian experience in its first "creative" stage. From this fact, seen in the light of the action of the Church in fixing a definite "Canon" or list of books, which are to be regarded as authoritative in determining the content of the Christian faith, he deduces a remarkable conclusion, for which no doubt his study of Butler's *Analogy* is ultimately responsible, viz., that Holy Scripture stands to the Theologian in the same relation in which the natural world stands to the man of Science. All the materials for the construction of a complete view of the spiritual universe are stored up there.

"Jesus Christ is to be known from the Old and New Testaments taken together as science is to be learned from nature" (*Ecumenical Councils*, p. 322).

"There was much still, and would be always, for Christian thought and science to occupy itself with in

the Christian faith and life, but so far as the materials were concerned for all this future occupation they were complete in the primitive experience as recorded in the Scriptures, or if they were not, there was no means or possibility of future addition to them" (*Ecumenical Councils*, pp. 27 f).

This conception is, he feels, verified in experience:

"With whatever prepossession or freedom from prepossession we undertake it, the effect of an exact spiritual study of the mind of the New Testament, after that of any later movement of Christian thought, is surprise and wondering admiration. It is as true to the truth of the spirit as nature itself is to natural truth and in the same way. In the first place it is a unity, but a unity in diversity, and as it requires a whole mind to see the absolute unity of nature in its infinite diversity so also does it to see the one and whole Christ, in his every trait and aspect in the New Testament. And in the second place, while all the materials are given, no induction is made for us from them, but it is left to the spiritual science of humanity to construct for itself the Christ, as it is to physical science to arrive for itself at the unity and wholeness of natural knowledge. In this way we arrive *a posteriori* at a sort of natural conviction, that confirms the instinct of the church, of a divinity in Holy Scripture similar to that in nature" (*Ecumenical Councils*, pp. 323 f).

And he would have us notice that this limitation does not shut the door on further advance in the knowledge of the Truth:

"Already we find there (in the New Testament) all of Christianity that we know, and increasingly more of

it that we know not yet and are more and more coming to know" (*Constructive Quarterly*, III, 250).

D. The Science of Spiritual Psychology

We can pass on now to look more closely into Du Bose's method and see if it admits of more precise characterization.

If we confined our attention to his account of the place of Holy Scripture in Christian thought we might describe his method as a method of induction from the facts which underlie the New Testament records. Such a description, however, would be at best incomplete. It would tell us nothing with regard to the class of facts which he singled out for observation, and the kind of evidence to which he appealed. In this connection his own account of the influence that determined the form that his public teaching took is illuminating.

I began "to read with an advanced class Aristotle's Ethics—for both the Greek and the philosophy. Unconsciously Aristotle became the basis and starting point of all my thinking. I seemed to find in him the true root and starting point of all thought or knowledge of myself: Socrates' 'Know Thyself' found in him, in the third generation, its scientific response, or at least the beginning of it. I began to apply his principles and follow his lines, and found that instruction built up on that foundation was not only more satisfactory to myself, but more intelligible and self-evident to the classes than upon any other system" (*Turning Points*, p. 6).

Here surely we have the key we are in search of.

The centre of Du Bose's interest lay always in personality. His appeal was to experience. His attention is fixed on the facts of consciousness. The secret, therefore, of the attraction of Aristotle's Ethics for Du Bose is self-evident. Aristotle's treatise is based throughout on a first-hand examination, on the one side, of the facts of consciousness as throwing light on the constitution of the soul, and on the other, of the facts of common language, that "rich storehouse of human experience" as revealing the popular estimate of various elements in human character. It would be difficult to point to any philosophical treatise in which the reader is kept so habitually in touch with life and reality. It is not surprising, therefore, that Du Bose found it an introduction not only to the subject-matter of Ethics, but to a method which is strictly psychological. Once wedded to this method, for which he had a strong natural affinity, he was ready when he came to present Christ and Christianity to Theological students to make a new application of it, and so to make a contribution all his own to the science of Spiritual Psychology—or, to use more familiar phraseology, to the study of the religious Consciousness.

In so doing he was in complete harmony with the trend of modern thought both in philosophy and in theology. On all sides there is a revolt against abstractions. Psychology is taking the place of Metaphysics in Philosophy. We are more interested in the study of the facts of consciousness than in the rules of Logic, or even than in the laws of Thought. In Theology voices are making themselves heard calling for someone to translate "a theology that was cast in a Scholastic mould into a Theology based on psychology," and "to express the truth of the Creed in terms which can

appeal to those who are accustomed to think in the terms not of metaphysics but of personality." This being so, those who make this demand should feel a special attraction to Du Bose. It is precisely the task on which he worked for forty years.

It must be the work of subsequent lectures to discuss the special contributions that he made by the application of this method in different departments of Theology. Our present task is simply to define the distinctive element in his contribution to the study of the religious consciousness in itself. In brief it consists in the fact that he took the New Testament as his text-book, and studied it for the light that it throws on the spiritual experience not only of St. Paul and of the other Apostles but of our Lord Jesus Christ Himself.

The field of investigation in connection with the religious consciousness is no doubt wide, and evidence can be drawn from many different quarters. Professor W. James, among other things, demonstrated the value of evidence largely pathological in his *Varieties of Religious Experience.* Professor Pratt, in *The Religious Consciousness,* examines the normal religious consciousness partly by means of Questionnaires, and partly through his own wide and sympathetic acquaintance with various forms of organized religion both within and without the limits of Christianity. Professor Granger, in *The Soul of a Christian,* bases his results on the autobiographies of St. Augustine, St. Theresa, and John Bunyan. Du Bose, as we have seen, felt the primary importance of the experience of the first generation of Christians, and fixed his attention on the record of that experience which the Church accepted as Canonical.

He began, as he has told us, with St. Paul. He learnt

Christ first of all in the mirror of St. Paul's reaction to Him. It may seem a narrow field, but at least he explored it thoroughly from the psychological side, testing it for himself and encouraging his pupils to test it for themselves, as the Church has tested it down the ages, in the light of direct spiritual experience. He checked his results by the study of the other Epistles and found, in spite of formal differences, a deep and substantial harmony between St. Paul's experience of the salvation that was his in Christ and the experience of St. Peter, St. John, and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. But he could not stop there. This experience of the salvation that is ours in Christ is so vitally dependent on the personal relations both ways between ourselves and Christ that he had to press on and explore in all reverence the religious consciousness of Jesus Christ Himself, as it is revealed to us through those who had knowledge of Him both before and after His Ascension. A moment's reflection is enough to show that this and nothing short of this is the true goal of the inquiry into the nature and content of the Religious Consciousness to which we are committed. I cannot doubt that as the years go by our sense of gratitude will deepen towards one who in comparative obscurity, with characteristic fearlessness, explored the path by which it may be attained.

LECTURE IV

HUMAN NEED AND THE ORIGIN OF SIN

A. Human Need

We have seen that Du Bose's method of handling the problems of Theology was essentially psychological. We pass on to study that method in operation, and to consider the results to which it led him. We shall concentrate attention first on *The Soteriology of the New Testament*, the book embodying the fruit of twenty years' experience in the application of the method to the needs of successive generations of students, in which he first challenged the attention of the theologians of his time.

The title was no doubt chosen deliberately. He felt, I think, that he was approaching a familiar subject in an unfamiliar way, and wished to guard his readers against supposing that he was offering them a formal treatise on "the Atonement" or on "the Plan of Salvation." Unfortunately none but professed theologians had heard of Soteriology, and it is to be feared that the uninitiated never realised that the book, in spite of the rather alarming appearance of Greek words here and there in the text, is singularly free from technical phraseology. It is throughout an appeal to the New Testament in the light of what may and indeed ought to be universal Christian experience.

The book is inspired throughout by the conviction that "the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation unto every one that believeth." It is a study of

Christianity in the light of its Divinely appointed goal, and thereby avoids the danger of measuring by a bent rule which affects all theologies that start from the Fall; and the appeal to experience keeps the treatment of the problems both of the Atonement and of Christology concrete and personal. It issues, therefore, in what we have seen to be Du Bose's characteristic contribution to theological thought, an interpretation of Christianity in the terms not of metaphysics but of personality. It provides an admirable introduction to the science of Spiritual Psychology, to the study, that is, of the phenomena of religious consciousness on the transcendental side, the side of free personal activity and of God, which the student of the succession of psychical states, regarded as a self-contained series, is *ex hypothesi* bound to exclude from his consideration.

The form of his exposition is fundamentally, though not obtrusively, moulded, as Du Bose himself gave us reason to expect, on that of the Ethics of Aristotle. It is an examination of the true end of man by direct inspection of the facts of his constitution, and of the meaning of the terms employed in the New Testament to describe his characteristic spiritual qualities. Du Bose had learnt from Aristotle to study the true nature of anything in the light of its "end." He accepts whole-heartedly Aristotle's conclusions with regard to the nature of virtue and to the task of rationalising his animal propensities with which every man is confronted. But he raises the investigation into a higher plane by taking into account a whole department of human life, which lay beyond Aristotle's horizon. Brilliantly equipped as Aristotle was on the intellectual side, he shows singularly little capacity

for response on the side of the spirit. GOD was for him, as F. D. Maurice points out in his Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy, " merely the crowning result, or at least a necessary postulate of his philosophy." He was no felt need of his heart. So for Aristotle Ethics were simply a department of Politics. They stand in no organic relation to Theology.

Du Bose, on the other hand, recognised in man, not only (1) a physical nature with animal instincts and impulses which respond automatically to stimuli coming from within and from without, and (2) an ethical " personality," involving a capacity for conscious and free activity in obedience to law, and entrusted with the task of rationalising or moralising this " animal " nature, but also (3) a spiritual capacity for communion with God in a relationship transcendent, personal and free, which when consummated is nothing short of a true Divine sonship.

This spiritual capacity Du Bose believed to exist in all men. He maintained indeed, as we shall see, that no man could rationalise his animal nature and become his true self unless he exercised this spiritual capacity and laid hold of God. In other words, he held that a man, if he would be a man, must not only rationalise the animal in him, but also spiritualise the natural. Sonship, however, as he conceived it, is so essentially on both sides a personal relationship, that he shrank from using any language which might lead a man to rely on it as a fact of his nature, independent of the consent and co-operation of his will. We shall have to return later to this distinction between " nature " and " personality," which is fundamental in all Du Bose's thinking, as well as to a subordinate distinction between " individuality " and " personality." Our

present point is that for Du Bose this spiritual capacity was an essential part of man as man. It is not surprising, therefore, that in his analysis of human need "Holiness" or personal union with God comes first, then "Righteousness" or obedience to the moral law, and then "Happiness" or "Well-being," the fulness of life with all its faculties perfectly developed in due subordination. These three needs are indeed vitally interrelated, but the deepest and most radical is Holiness. For we must not forget that human nature and human personality, whether in the race or in the individual, are not fixed and strictly definable entities. They are alive and growing, and Du Bose contends that there can be no final realisation of self by self except in God.

This brings us naturally to the consideration of the problem of self-realization. In his later writing Du Bose calls attention to three difficulties, which, apart from the complications introduced by Sin, stand in the way of its solution. The first comes from what he calls the *vis inertiæ* of an established order. Use and wont inevitably and rightly form chains of habit which fetter growth. For there can be no progress without some breaking with the past. We are all therefore bound to rouse our wills to fight against sloth. Life is an energy overcoming obstacles.

The next difficulty is inherent in the attractiveness of the appeals that come to us through our sensuous nature. It is entirely right that we should be sensible of the attraction. Life begins in a body. We have to train our senses to distinguish between the different objects of desire, each inherently good, that suggest themselves. But desire must be servant not master, and it will not submit without a struggle. So we have

to fight to avoid sinking in the slough of sensuality. The sense-plane is indeed not an evil to be cast out: but it is to be transcended, and brought into subjection, and made the instrument of righteousness.

A third difficulty comes from the instinct of self-preservation. It is a strange paradox, but it is true, that we must sacrifice our souls if we would save them. There is no other escape from the death of selfishness. Christ died to self and sin in the complete surrender of His will to God. It is clear, therefore, that Du Bose would go all the way with Dr. Tennant in his *Origin and Propagation of Sin*, not only in his repudiation of the possibility of inherited guilt, but also in his contention that there is nothing in itself "sinful" in the conflict between duty and inclination which these considerations show to be inevitable. This conclusion is, however, so far merely negative. It tells us what is not sin. It does not tell us what sin is, or how it has come to be such a terribly insistent part of our religious consciousness. The question merits close examination, both for its own sake and in the interest of yet more vital Christological problems, which will arise later.

B. The Origin and Nature of Sin

Dr. Tennant, approaching the problem from the standpoint of empirical science, gives the following account of the gradual evolution of the moral status both of the race and of the individual.

"Moral sensibility emerges in the course of mental education, and the content of the ethical ideal is the later gift of social heredity, for which physical heredity only supplies the empty and bare capacity. Conduct

that before was neither good nor bad but innocent now becomes necessarily and increasingly either good or bad. Evil is not the result of a transition from the good, but good and bad are alike voluntary developments from what is ethically neutral. Sin only emerges when the moral sense has begun to pass upon our thoughts and actions a moral condemnation. The individual thus discovers himself to be sinful. He does not rightly find himself to have been sinful in the past in which he knew no law, or to have been 'subject from birth to an indwelling power of sin.' If his consciousness tells him that he has thus been from the first the subject of sin, it is because it expresses its immediate experience in terms of a theory supplied by uncritical and unreflective 'common sense,' and uses a rhetorical and faulty metaphysic. What introspection really discovers is an internal conflict between nature and nurture, natural desire and moral end; and this is the inevitable condition of human life and the expression of God's purpose. We feel ourselves to be constantly solicited towards conduct which must be reckoned sinful when the moral faculty has entered upon its infinite possibilities of development. An impulse of greater intensity but lower worth conflicts with another of higher worth but lower intensity. This is temptation. It divides the man against himself: his natural animal basis against his acquired human conscience. Without both these elements, temptation and law, he could not be a finite moral being. And if man is thus the product of development, and sin is thus resolvable into factors (the flesh and the law of St. Paul), it is no longer possible to put the old question which has so long troubled the theologian: 'How does such a discord as sin arise

in human life wherein everything indicates unity and harmony as its normal condition?' The question rests upon an entirely erroneous prepossession. Empirical science asserts that the discord in us is not sin until we make it so, and unity and harmony, in the sense of freedom from effort to avoid evil, never has had actual existence. Calm's not man's birth-gift any more than it is 'life's crown,' 'though calm is well.' 'A spark has *disturbed* our clod.' Man was born to trouble: to the arduous task of subjugating and annexing his organic to his rational and moral nature" (*The Origin and Propagation of Sin*, pp. 114 ff).

In other words Dr. Tennant warns us that in the light of modern science the traditional conceptions both of an "original righteousness" and of "original sin" must be entirely recast, if the truth that lies at the back of them is to be preserved. Similarly, criticizing Kant's doctrine of "radical badness," he writes, "Kant takes for his premiss that our 'bias' is rightly to be called evil: therefore, he argues, in accordance with his fundamental principle, it is to be referred to the will. Our future argument on the contrary starts from the empirical fact that what is (illegitimately) called our evil 'bias' is not to be referred to the will, and therefore it cannot be called evil" (*ibid*, p. 193).

Du Bose's position with regard to "Original Sin" is in fundamental agreement with this. The so-called sin of nature is not sin at all. "It might be a natural bias or inclination or proclivity to sin; it might constitute in us a natural impossibility of not sinning; as St. Paul says that the law cannot produce righteousness in us on account of the *weakness* of our flesh. But *whatever* be the fault or corruption of the nature

of every man who is born of Adam, it is not *in itself* properly sin, but only becomes so in the will and personal activity of the man himself. When the man *does* sin, as every man sins, we may then trace it back —not, as I was about to say, to its origination in the nature, for sin cannot originate in the impersonal nature, but only in a person, but—to the temptation or the weakness in the nature which made it impossible for him *not* to sin ; and in this way we may attribute the sin to a so-called sinful nature, or flesh " (*Soteriology*, p. 233).

The matter, however, can hardly rest there. Granted that sin is resolvable into factors " the flesh and the law," and that the flesh, though from it come " the possibility of sin, the instruments of sin, and the temptations to sin," yet cannot in itself be properly termed sinful : granted that " the actuality of sin " for empirical science " is derived solely from the individual will influenced by its social environment," we are still left wondering what after all is this actuality of sin ?

It is no use trying to escape from the verdict of my own conscience, and the sense of inalienable guilt after any fall into sin that it brings with it, by throwing the blame on my instincts and impulses or on my social environment. If I had been wholeheartedly on the side of the impulse of higher worth, the lower would not have prevailed against it. I was under no compulsion to follow the multitude to do evil.

Or, leaving the question of guilt to Him who is greater than our hearts and knoweth all things, let us confine our attention to the insistent consciousness of present slavery. Dr. Tennant warns us that " if a

man's consciousness tells him that he has thus been from the first the subject of sin it is because it expresses its immediate experience in terms of a theory supplied by unreflective 'common sense,' and uses a rhetorical and faulty metaphysic." Let us then drop the words "from the first" and examine "the immediate experience." That is admittedly an experience of slavery to sin. Once more we ask what is sin? My will brings it into manifestation. Yet it masters my will. It is in me though it is not me. It makes me a slave. Can "accurate psychological or ethical analysis" ascribe power over persons to a logical abstraction or to faulty metaphysic or to a material object? Is it as certain, as Dr. Tennant seems to think, that St. Paul was mistaken in personifying it?

This power is in the experience of each of us a real power, and it is a spiritual power. If it is one and the same power that affects us all, would not that explain the strange solidarity of evil in the world, a solidarity which is not to be confounded with the solidarity of the race, though both solidarities combine to make "sin" and not merely "temptation" a race fact. Du Bose, at least, keeping close to St. Paul, leaves the door open for this solution. "Sin," he says (*St. Paul*, p. 208), "is in its actual operation certainly not an individual but a collective thing; it is in us as one man, in our solidarity as a race." And again (p. 212), "sin, in a word, is something not ourselves, in relation with which, in reaction with or against which we ourselves become sinful, or else holy." And, if we are told that this conception of sin, as a personal power not ourselves working for unrighteousness, is "certainly Manichæan," we may at least plead that, if we may accept the evidence of the New Testament, St. Paul, St. John,

and Our Lord Himself entertained it; and there does not seem anything strikingly Manichæan in the one reference that Du Bose makes to the devil in his *Soteriology* (p. 25). "The devil himself is to God's saints a ministering spirit sent forth to minister to the heirs of salvation."

Whatever may be the ultimate verdict on this point, the fact of sin introduces serious complications into the problem of the supply of the three fundamental needs of the whole race. Our sins separate us from God, and we cannot attain to that oneness of nature with Him, which is Holiness, without Atonement. Our wills are, as we have seen, enslaved by sin, and we cannot render that free obedience to the law of our being, which is righteousness, without Redemption. Through Sin, Death has entered into the world, and we are spiritually, morally, and physically in the bondage of corruption. We can only attain to the fulness of life by Resurrection.

Here, then, is the sum of human need as it is revealed by a study of the facts of human experience in the light of the New Testament. We find ourselves in this world engaged in a fight with temptation on the road to the attainment of our true moral and spiritual personality, that is, of Holiness, Righteousness and the fulness of Life. Owing to the fact of Sin we need not only help to overcome adverse conditions in ourselves and in the world, but also Atonement, Redemption and Resurrection. Such is the need which, according to the word of the truth of the Gospel, has been supplied for the world by the salvation that Christ wrought and is. We must go on to examine Du Bose's exposition of the way in which this supply is adapted to the satisfaction of our need.

LECTURE V

CHRISTOLOGY IN THE LIGHT OF SOTERIOLOGY.—I

A. A New Approach to the Study of the Incarnation

1. We have considered Du Bose's analysis of human need: the first of the problems that meet us when we seek to understand the nature of Salvation from its psychological side. His most original contribution to Christian thought comes from his application of the key provided by this analysis to the eternal problem of the nature and person of Christ.

There was, of course, nothing new in his recognition of the inter-relation of the Incarnation and Human Salvation. That recognition is at least as old as St. Athanasius and the "Nicene" Creed. Only with Du Bose the centre of interest is not, as it is, for instance, with St. Anselm and Dr. Forsyth, the Divinity of our Lord as his qualification for the task of satisfying the claims of the Divine Justice, or as our Surety in the great transaction between our souls and God, which is the foundation of the characteristically Christian experience of life and joy and peace. It is his Humanity, as the means by which after reconciling us to God, redeeming us from the slavery of Sin, and raising us out of Death, He mediates to us on the one hand the Grace of Holiness, Righteousness, and Life, and becomes on the other the Author and Perfecter of our Faith.

The true and proper Deity of Christ was indeed no less fundamental in Du Bose's Christology than in that of any of his predecessors. Note, for instance, his passionate protest (*Soteriology*, pp. 228 f).

"Do we sacrifice or imperil anything of what a truly catholic theology has labored through all the ages to protect and defend in the above analysis and description of the human sinlessness of our Lord? It may seem to, or may in fact, sometimes differ from the traditional methods and language of defence, but does it lay an unbelieving or irreverent finger upon the thing defended and to be forever defended? Then let it go; for to impugn or impair by remotest corollary or consequence the Christian pre-supposition of the essential human sinlessness, and the very personal deity of the incarnate Son of God, is to lay an impious finger upon the spiritual, moral, and natural order of the universe, and to err against the true nature, dignity, and destination of man."

He approaches the problem of Salvation, however, not from an *a priori* examination of the conditions to be fulfilled on the Divine side, but from the side of human experience, and from this side, though the impotence of human nature to attain its appointed end in its own strength makes it clear that Christ, if He is indeed to become our Salvation, must have come from God, and be in a strict sense Himself God, yet His Divinity can only be apprehended by us through the mirror of His Humanity.

"I myself have no hesitation in denying any presence or operation of real deity in Jesus Christ as manifested otherwise than in the fact of His accomplished

and perfected human divinity" (*The Reason of Life*, p. 245).

Let us look then, once more, at our need, this time to see what conditions must be fulfilled in Jesus Christ as our Salvation. Our task is to moralize the animal and spiritualize the natural in us. Our goal is a union of heart and will with God, which is Holiness, the fulfilment of the law of our being, which is Righteousness, and a complete development of all our faculties which is the Fulness of Life. Christ as our Salvation must help us to attain this goal, as alone it can be attained, by our own free activity. To this end He must first give us a vision of the goal, and an assurance that it is within the reach of a nature such as ours. He must at the same time provide the energy whereby we may strive effectually to attain it. Christ, that is, must be first "a sample or example" of what human salvation is: then, the source of its supply: and finally, in an even deeper sense, He must be Himself the very substance of our salvation.

2. If so, we must be prepared for what is nothing less than a revolution in our apprehension of the fact and method of the Incarnation. Approaching it from the divine side, we have hitherto regarded it simply as "a birth of Deity into Humanity" to all intents and purposes complete when the infant Jesus was laid in His manger cradle at Bethlehem. We have to regard it henceforth as a lifelong process.

We have, of course, always known that the Child Jesus grew, "passing through all the stages of human life that He might sanctify them all," as an Elder quoted by Irenæus says. We have no difficulty, therefore, in believing that He entered stage by stage into

the full possession of all His characteristically human faculties, and even that He did not attain to the fulness of all that is implicit in human nature until after He had passed out of the body of His humiliation into the body of His glory. The manhood that He assumed was not perfected before the Ascension. The Incarnation, so regarded, is clearly an act extending over the whole of our Lord's earthly life—and even beyond it. For St. Paul has familiarized us with the thought of the Church as the Body of Christ in which He is still even now "being fulfilled" (Eph. i, 19). We have always taught that the Sacraments are an "extension of the Incarnation." So we can grant further that the Incarnation of our Lord is "part of the universal process" which is still in progress.

Hitherto, however, we have seen in the Incarnation no activity but that of God. We have been unconscious of the possibility, let alone the necessity of any co-operation on the part of man. Or, if we find it impossible to ignore this necessity, so far as it affects our own relation to "the extension of the Incarnation," we have neglected to make any allowance for it so far as it affects our Lord Jesus Christ.

It is this neglect which Du Bose challenges, in the interest of a clearer understanding not only of the nature and process of our salvation, but of the fact and method of the Incarnation itself. The process of "being made a man," as we know it in our own experience, is the reverse of mechanical. Whatever may be the case on the physical side of our manhood, the whole development of the moral and spiritual side is dependent on our own personal activity. The nature that we inherit is only the raw material of the man that

we have to become. Clearly, therefore, if God became man, and not an automaton, in Jesus Christ, the Incarnation in Him cannot be the result of a merely physical and necessary process. We must make allowance on the side of His humanity for a definitely moral and spiritual activity. We must see in Him a human conscience and a human will, moralizing the animal nature into which He had been born. He had to develop character as we have to develop it, out of a conflict always possible, and sometimes, as at Gethsemane, acute, between duty and inclination; He had to grasp by faith under the most testing conditions and so to appropriate the eternal fact of His Divine Sonship by an obedience perfected through the things that He suffered in the course of a lifelong discipline.

3. It is a strong confirmation of the truth of this conception of the fact and method of the Incarnation that it, and apparently it alone, helps us to see in Christ, what the Gospel bids us see, our Salvation. First as "sample or example." If this is the way in which He came and clothed Himself in our nature, He became man under the same conditions under which we have to become men. He fought the fight that we have to fight in the flesh with sin and death, and we can see how His victory over them on the Cross may be ours also. He showed us, in spite of the presence of sin and death in the world, "what it were to be a man," the image of God after which we were created, and after which, therefore, we must be re-created if we are to attain salvation.

Then again—as the Way of Life. Our goal is nothing short of the substantiation of our Divine Sonship. And Sonship is essentially a relation between

persons. It implies both a voice from Heaven saying to a man, "Thou art my son," and the spirit of a son in his heart whereby he cries, "Abba, Father." In other words it is, on the one side, constituted by divine appointment. It is the result of a free outgoing of the Divine Love, it is "of Grace." And on the other side it has to be appropriated by a response that is none the less divine that it is intensely human, the response of Faith and Hope and Love. And this view of the Incarnation shows us Jesus Christ, not only as the voice of God, calling us to rise to the height of our Divine Sonship, but also as the spring of power from on high to enable us to respond to the call, as He responded in the days of His flesh. He will baptize us with the spirit of Sonship with which He has Himself been baptized, and for which He has in His human nature provided a living temple.

But even that is not all. He is not only the Way. He is Himself our salvation. We only find our true selves when we lose ourselves in Him, when it is no longer we that live, but He that liveth in us. For, "Jesus Christ was man, and was a man. But He is also all humanity, and if in simple faith and hope and love, which will carry with them all the desire and purpose and effort of which we are progressively and increasingly capable, we will put ourselves and be in Him as He is in us—if we will truly apprehend that for which we are apprehended in Christ Jesus; then we shall know in time, though we may never be able to explain in terms, the truth and actuality of an Incarnation which, beginning and ending in Jesus Christ, includes and completes us all" (*The Reason of Life*, p. 259).

B. The Human Nature of Christ under the Same Conditions as Ours

1. There is a further consequence of this approach to the doctrine of the Incarnation from the side of its relation to human salvation, to which it is important to call attention both on its own account and because it was the chief cause of the suspicion with which Du Bose was regarded by the popular organs of religious opinion. It is little to the credit of the serious students of Theology on both sides of the water that they should have paid so little attention to his singularly penetrating and comprehensive analysis of a very difficult and delicate problem.

It was of the essence of Du Bose's view of our Lord's relation to human salvation that He should have triumphed over sin and death in our nature, under conditions precisely the same as ours, except so far as ours are affected by sins for which we are individually and personally responsible.

As long as we are content to regard the Incarnation simply as " the birth of deity into humanity " by an act of God, in which the human element has no share, whatever our theory with regard to the nature of the human element may be, we are to all intents and purposes treating it as impersonal, and to ascribe moral qualities to it by itself is strictly meaningless. Theologians had, however, got into the habit of speaking of the " nature " which we inherit as " sinful," because we are all sinful in it, and consistency required us to speak of the human nature into which He was born as " sinless " because He was sinless in it.

Dangerous consequences follow from an inaccurate use of language. It is only too easy to shirk personal

responsibility for our sins by throwing the blame on our "sinful nature." It is impossible to see our Lord's triumph over sin in its true light while we attribute it to the fact of His Human Nature, and not to the use of His Human Will.

Du Bose, however, thanks to his psychological interest in the problems of Salvation, was fully alive to this danger, and avoided it by drawing a sharp distinction between "nature" and "personality," and as far as possible confined the use of the epithets "sinful" and "sinless" to "personality" as distinguished from "nature." At the same time he maintained the strict identity in respect of inherited nature between our Lord and us.

2. His distinction of "nature" and "personality" is, as we have seen, in complete harmony with the conclusions of empirical science as formulated by Dr. Tennant. And it is interesting to notice that Dr. Tennant expressly and independently supports Du Bose's contention with regard to the identity of "inherited nature."

He writes as follows:

"If the view of human nature and human sinfulness advocated in Lecture III be correct . . . it will follow that there can be no difference between our Lord's "nature" and ours. If ours is normal, the natural product of a course of evolution whose only ultimate cause is God, and our inborn faculties have not been affected by a catastrophic Fall, our nurture alone and not our nature being marred by human sin, then there is no reason to distinguish the endowments of His Body and Soul, in so far as those endowments were human, from those which we inherit. His sinlessness

consists in absence of actual sin: our sinfulness is the weaving of sinful acts into sinful habits and sinful character. His nature was necessarily neutral and non-moral, and the source of impulses, or bases of desire, whose indulgence would have produced sin. Without such impulses He could neither have been tempted nor have lived a moral human life. But His will never consented to such impulses when consent would have involved departure from the ideal of holiness" (*Tennant, l.c.* pp. 167 f).

In other words, our "nature," as Tennant conceives it, is composed of elements which come to us by inheritance through a long chain of Divinely appointed evolution. None of these elements is inherently evil. Each in its measure is capable of consecration. The "ape" and "tiger" in us are not there simply to be cast out. They are there to be tamed and set each to its appropriate task. They supply "the raw material of morality." They only cause trouble, as Plato pointed out, when they are allowed to get out of hand. So the root of our trouble lies not in "nature" but in "nurture."

This last word suggests important considerations. For, while in the last resort each man's responsibility for his own sin is individual and incommunicable—sin is a man's personal reaction to the law of his own being under the conditions in which he finds himself—yet "social heredity" has a large part to play in his "nurture" whether for good or for evil.

While on the one hand "the race's most important gift to the individual is the morality which itself has toilsomely and gradually won" (*Tennant*, p. 104), on the other it is the source of "*inbred* sinfulness derived

by us from our surroundings, our mutual inter-action and co-operation; it is the accumulated influences stored up in the social environment" (p. 72).

Difficult as it is to hold both sides of the truth together, there can be little doubt that sin is not only intensely individual. It is also a "race fact." The salvation of each individual sinner is complicated by his implication in a sinful society. We have to fight the world as well as the flesh. Our nurture can be marred by social pressure as well as by natural inclination.

3. Still, in the last resort, my sin is my own and not another's. I cannot evade my responsibility by throwing the blame on my "nature" or on "social heredity." It is I that have failed if my natural instincts and impulses have been too strong for me. And the fact would seem to be that, though I am capable of seeing the right and approving it, I have not the power, however much I may have the will, to do the right consistently in my own strength. The "spirit" may be willing, but the "flesh" (meaning by that not my inherited nature, the "non-moral source of my impulses and the basis of my desires," but my "natural" Ego) is weak. This "Ego," as St. Paul found, is in a state of bondage from which it cannot break free.

This bondage of the Ego is, I take it, what Kant called "the radical badness" of human nature. We are powerless in our own strength to realise the ideal of Holiness, of which none the less we have a clear intuition. Our consciences, in spite of evolutionary illumination, persist in characterising our state as not only wretched but sinful. Our failure comes from disregarding God's will. In God's strength if not in

our own we might have come out as victors from the trial, whatever it was. The philosopher's formula, "I ought, therefore I can," is only misleading, when I forget my relation to Him who appointed the trial, and Whose Will is my law, a relation which is a reality all the time whether I am conscious of it or not. So whatever may be our opinion of the phrase "Original Sin," we can all agree with Archdeacon Wilson* that "This conflict of freedom and conscience is precisely what is related as 'The Fall' *sub specie historiæ*. It tells of the fall of a creature from unconscious innocence to conscious guilt, expressing itself in fleeing from the presence of God." We can agree also that "this fall from innocence was in another sense a rise to a higher grade of being" (*ibid*). To become conscious of our need of God, however that consciousness is brought about, is the first step in regeneration.

4. Du Bose accepts Kant's account of our "radical badness," and equates it with St. Paul's doctrine of "the weakness of the flesh." He was prepared to retain even the terribly dangerous phrase "Original Sin" in maintaining the identity of the Human Nature that our Lord assumed with that of all the rest of mankind. In thought, however, if not in language, he is in complete agreement with Dr. Tennant.

"In reply to the question whether our Lord in His human birth took 'original sin' my answer would be that He took all of original sin except the sin, except that which makes it really and properly *sin*, viz., that it should have caused Him to sin, which it did not. That which destroys *us* in our nature *He* destroyed in our nature: that which is sin and death in us,

* Quoted by Tennant, l.c. p. 83.

because by reason of it we sin and die was not so in Him, who was the destroyer in Himself of Sin and Death" (*Soteriology*, p. 272).

The subject is a difficult one, and craves, as Du Bose reminds us again and again, exceptionally delicate handling. The sinlessness of our Lord is "not a vain thing for us. It is our life." For a man to say that Jesus has for him "the value of God," and at the same time to account some of His words and deeds as sinful, argues a deep insensibility to the place of Holiness in "the value of God." To sin is not, in spite of the proverb, a true part even of human nature, though liability to temptation at least in this world is. It is vital, therefore, to maintain that Jesus not only took a true human nature but also that He endured all our temptations without spot of sin.

Hitherto theologians have been accustomed to safeguard our Lord's sinlessness by postulating a fundamental distinction between the Human Nature that He assumed and ours. This was possible without affecting the reality of His Human Nature, because it was held that Human Nature had already in historical fact existed on the earth in two contrasted conditions; in the state of "Original Righteousness"* in which Adam was created, and the state of Original Sin into which all the descendants of Adam have been born since the Fall. Dr. Tennant has shown that this position can no longer be maintained in the light of scientific anthropology. Du Bose challenged it on soteriological grounds.

* If, as we have seen, there is a sense in which 'the Fall of Man' is true *sub specie eternitatis*, if not *sub specie historiæ*, it is at least possible that the same may be true of the 'Original Righteousness of Man.' See the examination of Edward Irving's position by F. D. Maurice in a letter to R. H. Hutton. See Appendix E.

In order to do justice to the disputants on both sides of the question we must never lose sight of the ambiguity of the term " Human Nature." It sometimes connotes the whole, sometimes only one side, of a complete manhood. Du Bose and Dr. Tennant use it in a carefully limited sense to denote the raw material of which human character is made. In itself it is ethically neutral, and cannot rightly be described as either righteous or sinful. They contrast it with the personality in a man which alone possesses moral and spiritual quality.

This enables them, as we have seen, to conceive of our Lord's Incarnation, so far as it affects " the raw material " of His human character, in a way that fits in with the ground scheme of human evolution, and not only safeguards His Sinlessness but gives His Righteousness that genuinely human and personal character which was seriously compromised on the traditional hypothesis. This does not, of course, solve the whole problem. But it clears the way for the last and deepest of the issues that have still to be faced in the inmost shrine of personality.

LECTURE VI

CHRISTOLOGY IN THE LIGHT OF SOTERIOLOGY.—II

C. The Human Personality of Christ

(a) *The Moral Antinomy involved in its Union with the Divine*

1. We have seen how Du Bose strove to safeguard alike the reality of our Lord's conflict with the whole range of human temptations and of His absolute sinlessness by drawing a sharp distinction between a man's " nature " and his " personality."

He was able to bring strong—in my judgment conclusive—evidence in support of his position from the New Testament. For instance, he was certainly right when he claimed that the words " in the likeness of the flesh of sin " in Rom. viii, 3, cannot be taken to imply that the likeness was merely superficial. We have not time, however, to consider this side of his argument in detail. We must press on to examine the implications of the fact that, while all the rest of mankind fail to master their inherited nature and become sinful, He knew no defeat, but came through the conflict unstained by sin, even though the allurements of natural inclination were reinforced by a social pressure, which was in many respects out of subjection to the will of God, so that His victory was not over the flesh only, but over the world.

In the light of this fact we have to admit, side by

side with the identity of "nature," a real difference in "personality" between our Lord and the rest of mankind. Here again, however, Du Bose is very jealous of any account of the difference which would be inconsistent with fundamental identity. Obedience with us can only be acquired by "obeying away the possibility of disobedience." He feels, therefore, that our Lord's human obedience can only have been acquired by direct conflict with this possibility.

2. On the other hand, we cannot admit that this possibility could ever have become actual in the case of our Lord. Had He sinned, the eternal purpose of God for man would have miscarried. The Divine Logos incarnate in Him would have been defiled by sin.

It is no doubt hard to know what to make of a possibility that can never become actual. Du Bose could make nothing of it. He could only say that the antinomy is inherent in the fact of the Incarnation. If we construe it from the Divine side we must, if we construe it from the human side we cannot, exclude the possibility of sin. We must pass on, therefore, to examine more closely the problem of the relation of the God-head and the Manhood in the "fact of the Incarnation," *i.e.*, in the indissoluble unity of the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The problem, we must remember, is how to conceive this unity of the two elements without impairing the perfection of either. We must not reduce the union to a mere alliance between a human person and God. We cannot surrender the conviction that the ultimately dominating element in the personality is the Divine. At the same time we must not destroy the reality of the human nature by depriving it of personal activity.

Human co-operation with the Divine operation is a vital element both in Incarnation and in Atonement.

Du Bose was fully aware that we cannot expect with our present powers to reach a final and complete solution of this problem. He was, however, very far from admitting that we are on that account justified intellectually and morally in shutting our eyes to the fact of the Incarnation. He would have us "carefully discriminate between the fact of Christ in the world and the science of Christ in the world* . The fact . . . has existed continuously from the beginning and will continue to the end, right through and despite the speculative doubts and questionings and even the practical mistakes and perversions of actual Christianity" (*Ecumenical Councils*, pp. 321 f).

Again at the close of the "Gospel according to St. Paul" (pp. 301 f) he writes:

"The completed work and results of the Incarnation certainly justify it as a fact, but because we cannot . . . construe it to our minds, or correlate it in thought, we either reject it altogether or evade it by half or seeming acceptances. It is one of the few ultimate matters in which the whole truth comes to us only through a childlike acceptance of actuality as matter of fact—as, for example, the actuality of human freedom in face of a universal cosmical necessity. The fact of the personal Divine and the personally human at once in the one person of Jesus Christ has to be accepted, not alone as a fact behind and above our comprehension or construing, but likewise as a fact necessary to any comprehending or construing of the higher facts of both God and ourselves. As we

* cf. P. T. Forsyth. *The Place and Person of Jesus Christ*, p. 294: "The science of it can wait, but the religion of it cannot."

are fairly launched upon the quest, the nearer we pursue it to the end the more are we persuaded that, at least in His relation with us, God is fully and completely revealed to us as God only in Jesus Christ; and equally, that we are our realised and completed selves only in Jesus Christ as God. I cannot construe the Incarnation in all its necessary co-existences and seeming contradictions either to myself or to others; but infinitely less can I reject the Incarnation without blotting out all eternal truth of the universe and all higher life of ourselves. However far off this and all similar attempts may be from solving, or even satisfactorily stating, our difficulties, we must not only for the truth's but for our very life's sake continue such attempts. We must, if only, hold on to and insist upon the opposite and complementary terms of our Lord's deity and His humanity, until we can better correlate them in our minds and approve their co-existent and equal truth to our reason."

(b) *The Development of the Human Personality*

It is not surprising, therefore, that we find him in all his books wrestling first with one side and then with another of this eternal problem. Only, as our past experience would lead us to expect, he consistently studies the Divine not directly but as reflected in the flawless mirror of its human embodiment. He has, in consequence, a definite contribution to make to Christian thought in regard to our Lord's human Personality. And he makes it, as he made his contribution to the better understanding of the "Human Nature" of our Lord at the expense of a deliberate breaking away from "traditional and accepted Christian thought and language." His treatment therefore calls

for no less careful attention to the precise meanings that he assigns to the key-words " nature " and " personality " in this new connexion.

In relation to " personality," " nature " has no longer the special connotation that it bore in relation to " sin." " The *nature* of a person is only the mode of his personality, or of his personal being and acting " (*Soteriology*, p. 138). He distinguishes also two senses in the term " personality."

" If, then, by ' personality ' we mean the *subject* of a personal mode of being or acting, our Lord had no human personality ; the *αὐτός* or *He* was Divine and *not* human. But if we mean *' the mode of being and acting '* of a personal subject, then He had a human personality " (*Soteriology*, p. 145).

" When the Church insists upon ' One Person in two natures,' by one person it means one personal *subject* . . . Jesus Christ was not the Logos *in* a man, which would be a union of two persons ; but the Logos *as* a man, or as man : one person in two natures " (*ibid*, p. 144).

It is clear, therefore, that Du Bose never lost his hold on the absolute unity and the essential deity of the Person of Jesus Christ.

At the same time he maintained that if we say that the Logos became man, we cannot mean less than that He became a human person, and accepted for the time all the limitations of human personality, together with the responsibility that, as we have seen, is the inalienable prerogative of our common humanity, of taking a direct and personal share in building up the character that constitutes his true self.

2. He distinguishes therefore three stages in the

manifestation of the Logos: (1) Before the Incarnation He was to our thinking a Divine Person in a Divine Nature, *i.e.*, He subsisted and acted after the Divine mode of being and acting. (2) While on earth He subsisted and acted after the human mode of being and acting: He was a human person taking His full human share in the Incarnation of the Logos in Himself. (3) After the completion of the Incarnation of the Logos *as* man by His resurrection and ascension He is a divine-human person fulfilling the eternal purpose of the Creation, by the Incarnation of the Logos *in* Man. These are stages, we must notice, in the unfolding before our eyes in time of what in the light of its end we see to have been the eternal reality.

"The Logos is the external expression of the eternal thought of God: and since it expresses the *whole* thought it must be God's thought of Himself as well as His thought of all things. The Logos is thus God's eternal thought of Himself, of the world, and of man" (*Soteriology*, p. 157).

When we think of Christ not as "Logos" but as "Son" our thoughts with regard to the Incarnation acquire a more definite content. We understand not only that it fulfilled a divine intention, but *what* the intention is. It is nothing less than that man, and the universe in him, should by a birth from above become partaker of the divine nature and so Son of God (cf. *Soteriology*, p. 159).

"As against Nestorians and Adoptionists we affirm that the Logos *became* man, and then as man *became* Son of God—and that neither by conversion of deity into humanity, nor of humanity into deity. For it was the nature and self-fulfilment of the Logos to

become man and of man through him to become partaker of the divine nature and life, which is to become Son of God" (*Ecumenical Councils*, p. 328).

In other words God and Man became one in the Logos, because they are eternally one in Him.

3. But this goal, we must repeat, could only be attained in manifested fact through the personal co-operation of our Lord's humanity. Being the Son of God He had to become the Son of God, *i.e.*, to manifest His Divine Sonship by a perfectly human and fully personal faith and obedience, and so take a real part as Man in the power of the Holy Spirit under strictly human conditions in His own Incarnation. Even "If He knew Himself to be the Incarnate Divine Logos it was not the direct divine self-consciousness of the Logos, but the human consciousness so incarnating as to be conscious of *being* the Logos" (*Soteriology*, p. 156).

(c) *His Individuality in Its Distinction from Ours*

1. At first sight this seems a curiously complicated and unsubstantial hypothesis. It merits, however, and will repay careful examination. We are very far as yet from having plumbed all the depths of our own personality. To take but a single point. I am conscious of being the centre of a conflict between two opposing forces or impulses which I can somehow discriminate as differing in moral value. It looks like a conflict between a higher and a lower "self," each claiming possession of "me." St. Paul calls the one "the flesh," and the other "the spirit." The one stands for our natural bias or inclination to gratify each passion or appetite of which we are conscious without regard to its relation to any wider or deeper considerations. The other stands for the voice of

conscience or duty, which witnesses in us to the paramount claim of these wider and deeper considerations. The inclination is not sin, but that which appeals to me through it is. To follow it is not to be my own master, but to become the slave of sin. I can never in the sense, which would be most gratifying to my pride, be my own master. What is set before me is simply the choice whom I will serve.

Further, I do not start as a finished product, a completely unified personality. I am making or marring "myself" all the time by my choice of masters. As long as I choose first one and then the other I show all the signs of a disintegrated personality. My only hope of final integration is to give myself up entirely to the Spirit: but this involves the surrender of that which is the distinctive element in my individuality, "my will," *i.e.*, the "denial" or "humbling" or "emptying out" of self. True personality can only be attained, as Janet* teaches, by the sacrifice, which is the exact opposite of the destruction, of individuality. I must lose myself, as Sir Galahad saw, if I would find myself.

Now this final integration, this attainment of my true personality, is the salvation which is brought within my reach in Christ. In Him I see myself according to God's thought of me, my Logos. At the centre of my being I find Him and myself in Him, and I live just in proportion as I abide in Him and He in me. In other words, I become myself as I incarnate Him. For "Jesus Christ not only assumed the common nature of us all but is also the common or universal personality of us all. He is the universal reason or wisdom, the universal will or freedom and

* See *Ecumenical Councils*, p. 316.

righteousness, and so the universal personality of every finite person in the world" (*Ecumenical Councils*, p. 326).

2. Let us now in the light of this typical human experience come back to Du Bose's account of the part that the Human Personality of Jesus had to play in incarnating the Divine Logos in Himself. In His human Nature—that is in the conditions under which He had to exercise and develop His human Personality —He had a human consciousness fully alive to all the impulses to self-indulgence that come to a man through his various appetites and passions whether physical or spiritual. He had a human will, which had to be surrendered to the Will of His Father, He had a human self to "empty out" (Phil. ii, 7), to "deny" and to "humble," He had to see Himself according to God's Thought and Word of Him, claiming Him as His Son. And by abiding in the truth of that Word, that is, in the Father from whom that Word came, and letting the Father abide in Him in the power of the Holy Spirit, He had to attain His true personality and to incarnate His true self, the Eternal Logos and Son of God, in human flesh.*

Now in this process the only difference between Him and us is that He becomes "universal or divine humanity incarnate in a particular man, while we are particular men who realize or attain our universal and divine humanity through Him" (cf. *Ecumenical Councils*, p. 327).

Or to put the same thing from another side. We each find ourselves, our common universal personality, and therefore our limited and eternally distinct individuality, in Him, while the distinguishing feature of His "individuality" is that He is the common universal personality of us all.

3. When we come back now to the question from

* See Appendix F.

which we started, the question of the precise nature at once of the identity and of the distinction in respect of "human personality" between our Lord and us, which may account for the fact that He succeeded while we all without exception fail in the conflict with sin in the flesh, we shall see, I think, that the answer must lie in this distinction between us in respect of "individuality." He came as man, to share with us all our natural disabilities, to be tempted with all the temptations to which His "human nature" exposes a man. Liability to temptation is of the essence of human nature. But He came as "perfect man" to show us the image in which we were created, "what it were to be a man," and sin is no part of our true human nature. It is a direct contradiction of it. It is, I think, clear, therefore, that even as a man it was impossible, morally impossible if you will (it is meaningless to speak of a physical impossibility in this connection), that He should sin. Even for us St. John says that sin is impossible as long as His seed, that is His life-giving word, abides in us. Even with Him this impossibility does not mean that His human personality, if it set to work to establish a righteousness of its own, out of dependence on God, could have escaped sin. The very effort after such independence is of the essence of sin. It simply means that His love to God and Man were so true and deep that there was nothing of "His own" for the devil to get hold of in Him.

It is possible, of course, and it may be necessary in order to safeguard our sense of the reality of His temptations to postulate with Dr. Forsyth that the fact of this "impossibility" was hidden from His human consciousness. In any case a way seems open for the resolution of the "moral" antinomy.

LECTURE VII

CHRISTOLOGY IN THE LIGHT OF SOTERIOLOGY.—III

D. The Hypostatic Union as a Fact

(a) *The Physical and Metaphysical Antinomies*

1. There remain the physical and metaphysical antinomies in regard to the union of the human nature and the divine which in logic are no less ultimate. But here also, if the Incarnation be a fact, we have an assurance that life must hold the key for the solution of difficulties which are insuperable in logic.

If in this faith we strive to get a clearer apprehension of the fact, one suggestion at least has been put forward as to the method of it from the Divine side which is illuminating. I met it first in *The Teaching of Christ*, by Bishop Moorhouse, published in 1891, the year before the *Soteriology*. He pointed out that the Incarnation is not an isolated phenomenon. It is the third of a series of three stages in what it is natural to regard as a progressive Divine self-limitation. The first is seen in the creation of the finite universe, which Dr. Martineau describes as "the stooping of the infinite will to an everlasting self-sacrifice." The self-limitation is even more pronounced in the second stage, which is marked by the creation of human wills left free to direct the power with which God Himself entrusts them either to the service of the selfish will to live, or of the Divine will to love.

In the light of these two precedents, he suggests that "It cannot be out of analogy with the highest and truest philosophy if we assume, in order to leave room for the essential limitations of our Lord's humanity, a voluntary limitation or suppression within the bounds of His human consciousness of the higher attributes of His Divine Nature" (p. 35).

Similarly Du Bose writes in his *Soteriology* (p. 150):

"I may or may not, within the limits of this present work, be able to touch upon the possible theories as to *how* the Divine Logos could contract himself to the beginning and growth of a natural human knowledge. But if He became man He certainly did so, and if He did not, then not only is the Incarnation emptied of all meaning, purpose and value for us, but it ceases to be an Incarnation."

I cannot myself doubt that the thought of the Divine self-limitation marks a distinct step forward in the understanding of the method of the Incarnation. We are, however, still left face to face with the question "Wherein did this self-limitation consist?"

2. Du Bose, in company with other thinkers, was inclined to distinguish two classes of qualities in the Divine nature, the one spiritual, moral and strictly personal, *e.g.*, love and holiness, the other "natural" or physical—of course, as expressing the mode of existence—*e.g.*, omniscience, omnipotence, and omnipresence. There is a startling difference between these two classes when we consider them in relation to the Incarnation. Love and holiness are the very essence of true humanity, omniscience, omnipotence, omnipresence are a denial in terms of the characteristic limitations of our human nature, at any rate in this

life, and are fundamentally inconsistent with the conditions of true human probation.

Du Bose therefore says plainly :

" The Incarnation is an incarnation not of the physical properties but of the spiritual, moral and strictly personal qualities of God. . . . If Jesus Christ then is what we might call the natural truth of the Incarnation we see God in him spiritually and not physically. His love is God, his holiness is God, his character and life are God, but then they are all equally man. Just those things were incarnate in Him that *could* become man, not those that could not. The Logos was incarnate in Him just in the way and to the extent to which it was the nature and the purpose of the Logos to be incarnate in man " (*Ecumenical Councils*, p. 332 f).

Now I find great difficulty in accepting this solution of the difficulty. I own I am suspicious of any attempt to find a difference in kind between the various Divine qualities and attributes. And also of any theory that seems to postulate a partial incarnation of the Logos. No doubt in a real sense Love is the Sovereign quality—it is more than a quality, it is the very essence of the Divine Being. No doubt also Love and Holiness are the first qualities that attract our attention in the revelation of God in Jesus Christ. But St. Paul would have us see in Him no less the Wisdom of God and the Power of God.

But the real root of my suspicion is this. In using language of this kind with regard to Divine qualities and attributes, we forget that we have no direct knowledge either of their nature or of their mode of operation. We can only know them indirectly so far as they are manifest in creation and providence, and,

of course, supremely in Jesus Christ. All statements therefore with regard to the nature or mode of operation of Divine qualities and attributes "in themselves" must be closely scrutinized. We do not know, we have not any materials out of which to frame an intelligent guess as to the meaning of omniscience, omnipotence, and omnipresence as characteristic of God in Himself. Whatever their meaning is in that connexion they must have been latent or laid aside by the Logos while He was incarnating Himself in human flesh on the earth. But we had to postulate a similar latency in regard to the specifically Divine element—its constitutional incapacity for sin—in Holiness. And just as the reward of "obeying away the possibility of disobedience" is for a man to attain a strictly Divine incapacity for sin, we see that Jesus by accepting the humiliation of the Cross has attained in His consummated Humanity to a share in the Divine omnipotence, omniscience and omnipresence, according to the spiritual meaning of those formidable words. He is "omnipresent" not by a physical extension through space, but by the presence of all things to Him.* He is omniscient, because all things are naked and laid open before the eyes of Him with whom we have to do. He is omnipotent, because He must reign till all enemies are brought into subjection under His feet. There is nothing, therefore, inherently inconsistent with a perfect humanity in the possession of these qualities. Only they are the goal and not the starting point of human development. And the Logos had to do without them while He was manifesting and incarnating Himself

* cf. F. D. Maurice. *The Kingdom of Christ* (Part II, Chap. IV, Sect. iv, 2.2), vol. II, p. 104, second edition. Coleridge: *Aids to Reflection*, p. 338, seventh edition.

in a growing and gradually maturing human consciousness. How this could be possible at all for the Divine Being, as also how it could be possible in regard to a single department of His Divine activity—His incarnate life in Jesus—while He was all the time quickening and illuminating and governing the Universe, is a secret which none but the Divine Being can fathom. We can only say with Du Bose to those who regard this self-emptying as inconsistent with the truest and most essential divinity:

"Is the act in which love becomes perfect a contradiction or a compromise of the Divine Nature? Is God not God or least God in the moment when He is most love? ... Where in all the story of the Universe was ever love so love or God so God?" (*Gospel in the Gospels*, p. 272).

(b) *The Antinomies Resolved by a New Line of Approach*

1. We have been considering the Incarnation hitherto in its relation to human salvation and therefore primarily for the light that it throws on the evolution of human personality. We have seen that Jesus Christ as our salvation is the key to that evolution, and that in Him Godhead and Manhood are manifested in an indissoluble unity. We have felt the difficulty of forming any clear conception of unity, which shall do full and equal justice to each of the elements of which it is composed. The question recurs again and again and will not be put aside. How can manhood be raised to the height of Godhead, or Godhead confine itself within the limits of manhood, without in either case ceasing to be itself?

2. It may be that, as Professor Sanday thought, help may come from a deeper analysis of the subliminal regions of human consciousness. Certainly

the recognition of unexplored depths in our own being makes it easier to conceive of the existence of latent faculties in human nature, and of the presence of "an inner man" in each of us where spirit with spirit can meet. But this sheds no light on the other side of the problem. How can a Divine Being inhibit the activity or withdraw the manifestation of every one of its distinctive attributes but love?

3. It is worth while reminding ourselves again at this stage of Dr. Mackintosh's (see Lecture III) contention that the root of the difficulty is "logical," not real. The person of Jesus Christ is a living whole. Each side of His twofold nature taken by itself is an abstraction. We only know either in its combination with the other. They are "two aspects of a single concrete life which are so indubitably real that apart from either the whole fact would be other than it is."

4. Dr. Forsyth's criticism of the traditional formula "One person in two natures" is on the same lines. The term "nature" is unsatisfactory. It is a term of "substance rather than of subject, of metaphysic rather than ethic, of things rather than persons." He prefers therefore "to describe the union of God and man in Christ as the mutual inter-relation of two personal movements raised to the whole scale of the human and the divine."

As such it is only the supreme example of the mutual involution of the human and the divine of which the whole history of the race is the expression. Prayer that ascends is moved by a spirit that comes down from heaven. "Man's word to God is interlocked with God's word to man. To conceive history as the field of these two movements on the upright plane of spirit—the upward movement of man's quest for God, and

the downward of God's conquest of man—is far more congenial to the mystery, grandeur and tragedy of the soul than the simple, evolutionary, and culminating process on the level plane of Time alone" (*The Place and Person of Jesus Christ*, p. 335).

"What we have in Christ, therefore, is more than the co-existence of two natures, or even their interpenetration. We have within this single increate person the mutual involution of the two personal acts or movements supreme in spiritual being, the one distinctive of man, the other distinctive of God, the one actively productive from the side of Eternal God, the other actively receptive from the side of growing man; the one being the pointing, in a corporeal person of God's long action in entering history, the other the pointing of man's moral growth in the growing appropriation by Jesus of his divine content as he becomes a fuller organ for God's full action on man" (*ibid*, p. 343).

God's union with man in Christ "was a relation that had its roots in Eternity, a relation within the absolute God, an immanence of the world in the Transcendent, of the corporeal personality in the spiritual" (*ibid*, p. 344).

In other words, the union of God and Man in Christ is the expression in Time of the union and communion of Father and Son in the unity of the Eternal Godhead.

5. I have quoted Dr. Forsyth at some length because he expresses, I believe quite independently, a conception of the Incarnation, which is in its main features identical with that of Dr. Du Bose. And though Du Bose did not find it necessary or even possible altogether to discard the use of the term Nature, on the main point of the essential inter-relation of the human and the divine, his conclusions coincide all along the line.

" In fact the natural and spiritual in us, the human and the divine, are not separate compartments, distinct elements in our being; each is perfect and complete only in and through the others, and all are one in an organic whole " (*The Reason of Life*, p. 241).

" Indeed any movement on our part is already His motion in us:

Every* inmost aspiration is God's Angel undefiled,
And in every 'O, my Father' slumbers deep a 'Here my child.' "
(*ibid*, p. 172).

" Grace is never bare operation: it is effectual co-operation. The subjects of grace are only those in whom its working is in, and with and through their own working. The perfection of the operation of divine grace in human co-operation is manifest in Him who could say, 'I and my Father are one.' 'My will is His and His is mine: my works are of course mine; and yet not mine but His in me " (*ibid*, p. 146).

" The divine is present and efficient in the human, while the human maintains all its integrity and acts freely in the divine, so that one and the same act is both human and divine; as, altogether, in our Lord one and the same person is both human and divine. The co-operation is not the semi-pelagian one in which each side does so much, in different parts; it is rather that of the hypostatic union, in which each does all, in perfect union, or unity, with the other" (*ibid*, p. 147).

The fact would seem to be that human personality, as it is constituted by, so it can only be defined in the terms of, its relationships, and of these relationships the deepest and most fundamental is its divine sonship.

* See Appendix G.

LECTURE VIII

THE DOCTRINE OF GOD AND OF THE CHURCH

A. God in Creation, Immanent and Transcendent

1. We have now reached the last and crowning stage of any study of Christology. We have to consider the light that it throws on the inner being and character of God. In considering this aspect of the problem, Du Bose started, as before, from the fact of Jesus Christ, and the interpretation of that fact in the New Testament—especially in this connection—in the Prologue to the Gospel and in the First Epistle of St. John. It is the main theme of the last and most mature of his treatises, *The Reason of Life*. His attention is concentrated from the first on the relation of the Logos to God and to creation. He accepts fully St. John's subtle and profound at once distinction between and identification of the Logos and God.

"The beginning of all distinction between a pantheistic and a theistic conception of the world lies in recognising the world as the expression, not of God Himself—or, as we say, 'of His substance'—but of His *Logos*, His Thought, Will, Word. The Logos of God, then, is not God (ὁ θεός); we distinguish Him. And yet certainly the Logos is God (θεός); we identify Him. Moreover, when once we have conceived and accepted God as eternal Father, we are in a position to assume that the *Logos*, not merely as the principle of the divine self-expression, but as God Himself self-expressed, must manifest Himself universally as

Son, or in sonship; since universal and everlasting Sonship is the only self-expression of eternal and essential Fatherhood" (*Gospel in the Gospels*, p. 283).

Again:

"Reason in God comes from itself, and is the principle, the effective beginning and constitutive cause of all processes of creation or evolution. . . . Thus that which was for God the beginning, for the world is the end: reason in God is eternally complete and perfect; reason in the world is incomplete, imperfect, and progressive; it has to make and re-make itself through deaths and births; to become itself through a thousand self-contradictions, which have to be survived and overcome.

"There is a deity immanent in the world which is God, and yet which is not God: which as God cannot be thwarted or defeated, and yet which, unlike God, is constantly thwarted and defeated, is resisted, grieved, quenched in ourselves, blasphemed and contradicted in the world without us" (*The Reason of Life*, p. 19).

2. Du Bose, it will be seen, though he disclaims any right or intention to trespass on the province of the biologist, yet thinks habitually on evolutionist lines, and indeed on the lines of "creative evolution." He realises so intensely the fact that on the spiritual side of our being we are living in what R. Browning calls "The Everlasting Minute of Creation," that he must have welcomed heartily, if it came his way, Bergson's reminder that the physical universe is still in the making. Indeed it is impossible to read his account of the "Evolution of Life" (*The Reason of Life*, p. 25 f) without being reminded at every turn of the *élan vital*. And the distinction that he draws above between the Logos as "God immanent in the world" and the

Father as "God transcendent" is in striking harmony with the thought expressed in his *Evolution and the Trinity*, by J. S. MacDowall, who, like Bergson, is a philosopher and a biologist.

3. Nor is this the only instance of a striking harmony between the conclusions of Du Bose and McDowall in regard to the spiritual truths suggested by, if not directly implied in, the facts of Biology. In this respect the Biologist is even bolder than the Theologian. He claims on the strength of his own experience a place of its own for Biology in the Præparatio Evangelica.

McDowall's experience as outlined in *Evolution and the Atonement* was this. The study of Biology opened out before him a consistent scheme of physical evolution. It showed him how in each case the creation of a new organ can be traced to the action of the environment on the organism, *e.g.*, how the evolution of the eye came in response to the action of the light, so that not only the light that we see by, but the development of the very faculty of sight itself, is the gift to us of the sun. When, therefore, he found that, after the line of physical evolution had culminated in man, man developed a spiritual faculty, he felt that this could only be explained on biological principles, as the response to a spiritual environment. Nothing short of the existence of God can account for the origin in man of faith in God. He thus arrived on scientific grounds at the same conclusion that Professor Pringle-Patteson maintains, as we saw in Lecture II, as a philosopher.

Du Bose arrived independently at what is substantially McDowall's position :

"If we so readily recognise reaction and interaction with environment in natural things, why not

equally expect and look for it in spiritual things? 'Word' and 'Spirit' most simply and exactly express media of relation and reaction between us and God, out of or apart from which we can as little become ourselves as the seed can apart from sun and soil" (*The Reason of Life*, p. 56).

"A function supposes an organ, as also an organ assumes a function. As a matter of creative evolution or evolutional creation, it makes no difference which was prior or produced the other. The point is the present fact or actuality of personal relationship and inter-communion with God. If religion is or exists at all, and is an integral factor in human life, and if it is a matter between us and God—'God and the soul, the soul and its God'—then God is no mere conjectural inference from known facts, no mere conclusion of speculative reason, but an object of actual experience and direct knowledge. In some way the Eternal Spirit bears witness with our finite spirits of the relationship between them, and the mind and affections, the will and purpose, the actions and character, the nature and life of God have entrance into and influence and shape those of men" (*The Reason of Life*, pp. 219 f).

B. God in Incarnation Manifested as the Holy Trinity

1. When we pass on from this conception of "life encosmic" to "life incarnate" the process can no doubt on one side be described as an immanent one: the light comes into the world through the evolution of our own faculty of vision and power of apprehension (cf. *The Reason of Life*, p. 38); but this, Du Bose would have us note, is not a complete account of the matter.

"The encosmic relation of God to the world is properly described as immanent, and is subject to the universal and admitted laws of immanence, uniformity, necessity and whatever else. But the *incarnate* relation of God to man is distinctively a transcendent one, a relation of either to the other from without. The former or encosmic relation underlies our natural constitution and faculties, our congenital affinity or congruity with God, our potentiality of the divine in ourselves. The relation of incarnation is one of spirits,—based indeed and conditioned upon that of natures, but in itself that of persons. The bond is one of mutual knowledge, love, will, action and life" (*The Reason of Life*, pp. 40 f).

And where can we see this relation in the perfection in which alone we can study it without distraction but in Jesus Christ our Lord?

As we gaze on Him we grow conscious not only of the presence of the Divine, but of a manifold Divine in One, Who in our flesh, looking up with eyes like ours to the Heavenly Throne sees on it the Father of us all, and lives in our flesh before the eyes of men in continual communion with Him, what St. John tells us (1 St. John i, 2 ff) was "the Life which was when time began" the life of communion between the Eternal Father and the Eternal Son, because the Father had poured out on Him and He had opened His heart to receive in all its fulness the Eternal Spirit. And so in and through Jesus Christ the whole being of God has been revealed. The incarnate Son revealed the Invisible Father by all that He did and all that He said in His life on earth by reason of the completeness of His self-surrender to do His Father's Will. And at the same time His faith and hope and love are the

outward manifestations of the power of the Spirit working from within to transform all the elements in His Human Nature into an image of the Divine glory.

2. In the light of this fact Du Bose's vision of God was Trinitarian through and through, though he dwells on it characteristically as a matter not of abstract thought but of spiritual experience.

"It is not too much to say that it is not possible to know God except in Trinity,—not a trinity of speculation and metaphysical thought, but the actual and practical Trinity in which God has made Himself knowable and known to us—without us by His Word, and within us through His Spirit" (*The Reason of Life*, p. 59).

C. The Church as an Extension of the Incarnation

1. In the last resort the only terms in which the Gospel is expressible are the terms of the Trinity (*Gospel in the Gospels*, p. 281).

Because God is Love, and Love must always seek to reproduce itself as Love, its characteristic description of God is as Father: and His characteristic activity is as Love, creative and redemptive, bringing many sons to glory. In humanity the inherent Divine Sonship which Creation was called into being to express attains self-consciousness, and therewith and thereby the Divine Fatherhood comes full into play.

Side by side with this revelation of the Fatherhood of God is the revelation of the grace of Jesus Christ by which we are called to respond to the claims of our Divine Sonship upon us, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit inspired by Whom we hear and respond to this call from the Father. So "love in the Father becomes grace or divine Self-communication in the Son,

and finally fellowship, or human participation in the Divine, in the Holy Ghost, in whom the Spirit of God and the spirit of man are brought into a divine-human unity, which is Christ in us" (*The Reason of Life*, p. 150).

And so the fact of the Trinity, as it is revealed in human experience, the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost supplies the spiritual environment in response to which the living organism of the Church is in process of evolution.

2. This is one side of the mystery of God in the Church, as Du Bose saw it. There is another side, which has come before us in other connections, but to which we must return for a few moments before we conclude. The Church baptizes her sons not only into the Threefold Name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, but also into the Body of Jesus Christ as Man.

3. The fulness of His humanity is always eluding us. The Gospels record the life of One, Who whatever else He was, was true man. St. Paul speaks of Him as " the man Christ Jesus." There is an attractive and transforming power in His individual personality. Many in our day are rightly jealous of anything which may interfere with the direct impact of the human personality of " the Jesus of History " upon the hearts of men. But that does not exhaust the mystery. In Jesus Christ we have not merely the crown and flower of the human race, we have a manifestation of the grace of God coming down to reveal the Father to us, and to take a personal share in ministering to our need by clothing Himself in a human personality. We must be prepared, therefore, to find deep beneath deep in that personality. One such deep is opened out by the experience of the Church, through her relation to Him as His Body.

Du Bose returned again and again to this point, especially in his Constructive Quarterly papers. Christ as Head of the Church is not only a man, He is Man.

4. The evidence on which he relies is simply this. The Christian experience as St. Paul knew it and interpreted it is nothing less than an interpenetration of personalities between the believer and his Lord. "I live yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me." But if so, who must He be, and what is His relation to the whole race, if no man can be his true self unless and until He is alive in him? What less can we say than that He must have what we can only call an inclusive Personality?

There are writers I know—Dr. Tennant, I am sorry to say, is one of them—who have no patience with any attempt to express the thought of a personality transcending individual limitations, and they no doubt will treat the phrase with contempt. The fact, however, will remain, waiting either a more appropriate phrase to fit it, or an expansion of our conception of the possibilities of personality. It is the fact that came before us in the discussion of the relation between our separate individualities and our Lord's, when we were seeking for light on our Lord's human development in the days of His flesh. We need it here to explain the relation between the members of His Body the Church, and their risen and ascended Head. With the aid of it the fact of Christ becomes luminous to thought. It becomes as it did for St. Paul, especially in his later Epistles, the key to "the purpose of the ages." The Christ of St. Paul so conceived is "the Logos" of St. John. The Logos, as we have seen, at once of humanity, of the Universe and of God.

For it is the purpose of God to sum up all things in Christ and through Him to reconcile all things to

Himself. And the instrument through which this reconciliation, this final and perfect consummation, is being wrought out is " His Body the Church."

One by one He takes our separate individualities up into Himself. As many as receive Him, to them gives He power to become children of God. And the Church, His Body, is the Sacrament of His continual presence among men, and the instrument for the completing of His incarnation, the fulness of Him Who is step by step attaining His perfected fulfilment as men respond to His call through the Church. For the Church is the lever in God's hand for the spiritual uplift of the whole race. It is His witness to the world of its redemption. Whenever we forget that, as God's people have always been prone to do, when we think of "election" as the private and personal privilege of a few, we become false witnesses of God. We are here, and the Spirit of God is with us, and the Lord is living and loving in and through us, in order that the whole race, which is one in Him, and which was created in Him, may in Him through us attain its consummation.

This is the vision of the function of the Church and of the bond which unites every member of it to Him to which Du Bose attained with growing clearness and intensity of conviction as he continued his lifelong effort to penetrate the Mystery of Christ. It is this that inspired that passionate expression of devotion to the unity of the Church, as its fundamental and all-creative characteristic, the source and spring at once of its holiness, its universality, and its mission with which our study began and in which it may now find an appropriate termination. God grant us grace to attain to that vision and to fix our gaze on it until we too are transformed into disciples of the Lord and Prophets of His Truth.

APPENDIX A

For light on the psychology of Conversion, if for no other reason, it will be worth while to compare with Du Bose's account of his own experience the accounts given by two other men, who in other respects have much in common with him, of their own spiritual awakening.

The first is the experience of Horace Bushnell, at Yale, in 1831. It is given in his own words in a sermon preached some years later in Yale College Chapel.

"Suppose that one of us, clear of all the vices, having a naturally active-minded, enquiring habit, occupied largely with thoughts of religion; never meaning to get away from the truth, but, as he thinks, to find it, only resolved to have a free mind, and not allow himself to be carried away by force or fear, or anything but real conviction—suppose that such a one, going on thus, year by year, reading, questioning, hearing all the while the Gospel in which he has been educated, sometimes impressed by it, but relapsing shortly into greater doubt than before, finds his religious beliefs wearing out and vanishing, he knows not how, till, finally, he seems to really believe nothing. He has not meant to be an atheist; but he is astonished to find that he has nearly lost the conviction of God, and cannot, if he would, say with any emphasis of conviction that God exists. The world looks blank, and he feels that existence is getting blank also to itself. This heavy charge of his possibly immortal being oppresses him, and he asks again and again, 'What shall I do with it?' His hunger is complete, and his soul turns every way for bread. His friends do not satisfy him. His walks drag heavily. His suns do not rise, but only climb. A kind of leaden aspect overhangs the world. Till, finally, pacing his chamber

some day, there comes up suddenly the question: 'Is there, then, no truth that I do believe? Yes, there is one, now that I think of it: there is a distinction of right and wrong that I never doubted, and I see not how I can; I am even quite sure of it.' Then forthwith starts up the question, 'Have I, then, ever taken the principle of right for my law: I have done right things as men speak; have I ever thrown my life out on the principle to become all it requires of me? No, I have not, consciously, I have not. Ah! then here is something for me to do! No matter what becomes of my questions—nothing ought to become of them if I cannot take a first principle so inevitably true, and live in it.' The very suggestion seems to be a kind of revelation; it is even a relief to feel the conviction it brings. 'Here, then' he says, 'I will begin. If there is a God, as I rather hope there is, and very dimly believe, He is a right God. If I have lost Him in wrong, perhaps I shall find Him in right. Will He not help me, or perchance even be discovered to me?' Now the decisive moment is come. He drops on his knees, and there he prays to the dim God, dimly felt, confessing the dimness for honesty's sake, and asking for help that he may begin a right life. He bows himself on it as he prays, choosing it to be henceforth his unalterable, eternal endeavour.

"It is an awfully dark prayer, in the look of it; but the truest and best he can make, the better and the more true that he puts no orthodox colours on it; and the prayer and the vow are so profoundly meant that his soul is borne up into God's help, as it were, by some unseen chariot, and permitted to see the opening of heaven even sooner than he opens his eyes. He rises, and it is as if he had gotten wings. The whole sky is luminous about him. It is the morning, as it were, of a new eternity. After this all troublesome doubt of God's reality is gone, for he has found Him! A Being so profoundly felt must inevitably be.

"Now, this conversion, calling it by that name, as we properly should, may seem, in the apprehension of some,

to be a conversion *for* the Gospel, and not *in* it or *by* it—a conversion by the want of truth more than by the power of truth. But that will be a judgment more superficial than the facts permit. No, it is exactly this : it is seeking first the kingdom of God and His righteousness—exactly that and nothing less. And the dimly groping cry for help, what is that but a feeling after God, if haply it may find Him, and actually finding Him not far off ? And what is the help obtained but exactly the true Christ-help ? And the result, what also is that but the Kingdom of God within, righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost ?

" There is a story lodged in the little bedroom of one of these dormitories, which I pray God His recording angel may note, allowing it never to be lost."

The second is the experience of James Moorhouse, Bishop of Melbourne, and afterwards Bishop of Manchester. It is recorded in a letter to his friend J. M. Wilson, Canon of Worcester, written in 1909, and in a memorandum which he wrote about the same time for his niece. The date of the experience was 1853.

In the memorandum he writes :

" I have lately felt a most curious sensation, urging me to write down an experience I had when quite a young man, while I was acting as tutor at Bexhill. I had been in a very despondent state of mind for several days, mentally and spiritually depressed. I had lost the sense of paternity, earthly and spiritual. I seemed to be alone in the darkness, groping my way.

" One night I remember praying most earnestly for light and guidance, for some sign of God's presence with me to encourage me and to guide me in my chosen path. I used some prayers in Jeremy Taylor's ' Holy Living and Dying,' for those in doubt and difficulty.

" I awoke during that night filled with the most marvellous happiness, in such a state of exultation that I felt as though a barrier had fallen, as though a door had suddenly been

opened, and a flood of golden light poured in upon me, transfiguring me completely. I have never felt anything in the least like it.

" I hid my face under the bed-clothes and gripped them hard to prevent myself from shouting out loud for joy. I was filled with the sense of God's infinite love for all creatures and for myself; and not only that, but I felt so full of it myself I could have done anything—embraced a beggar—as an expression of my feeling. The joy, the happiness, cannot be described. People talk of the happiness of heaven; if such happiness as I felt can continue for ever, it would indeed be bliss. I *was* in heaven. I felt so full of love to everybody that the words of the Sermon upon the Mount, ' Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you,' not only seemed *possible*, but they seemed the natural outcome of my state of mind. I could not help doing such things. I have never experienced anything in the least like it; but the words of St. Paul were actually true, ' I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.' I was possessed by the personality of Christ. At the time I did not think of it as Christ, but as God the Father; but now I see that He manifested Himself through Christ. Showing that if we are possessed by the spirit of Christ, which is love, we cannot help feeling as St. Paul did when he spoke those words.

" This state of mind continued about a fortnight. I could hardly go about my ordinary work, I felt so changed. I felt very much tempted to speak of it to somebody, but I never did. I *couldn't*. I said to myself, ' It is no doing of mine, if I speak of it I shall lose it.'

" At last it faded into light of common day, and I have never had the same feeling again—no, never—and that is what makes me feel ashamed. I was unworthy; it was light vouchsafed to me at a critical point in my life. I went back to the ordinary everyday life. I believe if I could have gone on like that I might have been a saint instead of what I am now. This is the foundation of my

firm belief which underlies everything—belief in the infinite love of God to me and all creatures ; and this has given me strength to stand up and fight battles for the truth. Besides its being the most certain proof of answer to prayer that I have ever had, another thing is the wonderful sense I had of being possessed by the personality of Christ. That to me *now* is a great proof of the truth of the Resurrection of Christ : it was a living, vivid personality, nothing dead about it.

" I am a most sceptical person, not given to imagining things ; but I *know* from my own experience that direct communion of the soul with God is possible. How do I know ? I have felt it. I know through Jesus Christ and my own consciousness. This is a fact as real to me and of far greater importance and more wonderful than anything that has happened to me in the whole course of my life. But I have never spoken of it before, and I do not wish it to be published in my lifetime."

To his friend Canon Wilson he writes :—

" I have been reading two fine books—Soddy's *Interpretation of Radium*, and Rufus Jones' *Studies in Mystical Religion*, and they have brought me thoughts which, I think, are good enough to communicate to you. Soddy shows clearly that the problem of our materialistic future is to learn how to liberate the potential energy in matter. And this is a grand parable. I believe that the problem of our spiritual future is to liberate the potential element of Divine Love buried in our human selfishness.

" I get at it thus. We cannot think of the soul under the forms of time and space. We cannot talk of five yards of soul. The soul is an Energy derived from and sustained by the Infinite Energy. We know it only by its qualities of emotion, intelligence, will. And these can be measured, not spatially, but by their intensity and direction. Fundamentally, I believe that there is only *one* spiritual energy —the energy of Love ; thought and will being only manifestations of that energy. And so we exist in the image

of God. The Infinite is beyond all forms of time and space —an Infinite Energy—the Energy of Love—infinitely intense, infinitely continuous, in its direction infinitely good. Love may have two directions—towards self, or towards God, and all the manifestations of God. Where love is directed towards self it is evil ; where towards God, in Himself or in His creatures, it is good. Now the good love in us is imprisoned in the dark element of the evil love, just as energy is imprisoned in matter. Our redemption means the liberation of the higher love from its imprisonment. Infinite Love is constantly working for its liberation. It was the task of the life of Christ. It is your task. It is a task which must some day have a triumphant issue. For without robbing man of his free-will to love, which is the basis of his moral distinction, Infinite Love must win in the end, here or hereafter. To speak reverently, God's mighty task is to make man love divinely, without robbing him of moral freedom.

" I do not think, dear Wilson, that I shall long continue in mortal life, and so I will give you from my own experience —an experience which has always seemed to me almost too sacred to speak about—confirmation in *fact* of this idea.

" For a year between my degree and my Ordination I was a private tutor at Bexhill. When there, and in contemplation of my life task, I was intensely anxious to come into some real communion with God. All my prayers were for some time fruitless, and I became very despondent. One night I woke from a dream that I was fatherless, and I cried aloud for love to my Heavenly Father.

" And *in a moment* my soul was so flooded by a mighty inrush of divine love and joy that it almost burst the bounds of personal restraint. To prevent myself from crying aloud in my joy I was obliged to wrap myself in my bedclothes. And for days this divine rapture lasted. I could hardly go about my ordinary business, and had to keep reminding myself that it was service to my Heavenly Father. I know that it is possible to suggest that this was

the result of an auto-suggestion. But, if so, then in my subliminal consciousness I must have a flood of love so deep as to be divine. For it made me love every one intensely. I could have embraced the poorest, dirtiest beggar in a transport of love. At last the vision faded into the light of common day.

" But I wanted no more evidence. I knew that I had been in immediate union with an *Infinite* Energy of Love. Jesus Christ's extravagant demands to love one's enemies, and to give and forgive without limitation, seemed the natural expressions of my feelings. My will for that time was His Will. And it was heaven. I had thrust open a door into the region of Infinite Light and Love, and all the reports of it seemed to me pale ; and all attempts at description ridiculous. I had been in heaven.

" Is not this exactly what would happen if the Energy of Infinite Love came into union with the eager will to love in my own soul ? The fact supports the theory. And it is all contained in that thrice-blessed saying, ' Love your enemies,' etc. ' That ye may be the children of your Father in heaven, for He maketh His sun to rise on the evil, and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.' "

APPENDIX B

F. J. A. HORT. *The Way, The Truth, The Life*, p. 11.

THESE four declarations of Christ [contained in St. John xiv, 6] provide us with ample materials for study on four successive occasions. Each has its own distinct sense, while each would be barely intelligible without the aid of the others. In the four together is expressed the Christian view of human existence as beheld in one primary aspect. The truth which they combine to set forth is not one of those lesser truths which can in any sense be either proved or disproved. Its evidence is to be found in the light which it brings, far more than in any light which it receives.

APPENDIX C

CHARLES SIMEON. *Memoirs*, Chapter XXVI, on "The Golden Mean."

PERHAPS you little thought that in what you have said about extremes, *and against the golden mean*, you would carry me along with you. But I not only go along with you, I even go far beyond you: for to *you* I can say in words, what for these thirty years I have proclaimed *in deeds* (you will not misunderstand me), that the truth is *not in the middle*, and *not in one extreme, but in both extremes*. I see you filled with amazement, and doubting whether I am sober, *i.e.*, in my sober senses.

Here were two extremes; observing days, eating meats, etc. "Paul, how do you move? In the mean way?" "No." "To one extreme?" "No." "How then?" "To both extremes in their turn, as occasion requires."

Here are two other extremes, Calvinism and Arminianism (for you need not be told how long Calvin and Arminius lived before St. Paul). "How do you move in reference to these, Paul? In a golden mean?" "No." "To one extreme?" "No." "How then?" "To both extremes: to-day I am a strong Calvinist: to-morrow a strong Arminian." "Well, well, Paul, I see thou art beside thyself; go to Aristotle, and learn the golden mean."

"But, my brother, I am unfortunate: I formerly read Aristotle, and liked him much: I have since read Paul, and caught somewhat of his strange notions *oscillating* (not vacillating) from pole to pole. Sometimes I am a high Calvinist, at other times a low Arminian, so that, if extremes will please you, I am your man; only remember, it is not *one* extreme that we are to go to, but *both* extremes.

APPENDIX D

Rev. H. Maurice Relton, D.D. *Christ and Metaphysics.* "The Interpreter," July 1922.

Now just as the living organism is or should be the fundamental conception of Biology, so the Living Christ, and not dead mental and intellectual abstract concepts of His Person, is or should be the fundamental conception of Christology. Christian experience must give us the truth concerning Him. Our method of approach must not be by analytical mental gymnastics "confounding the Natures" or "dividing the Persons," but by living the Life.

If we strive to live His Life in the world, reaching up to the ethical and spiritual level He has revealed to us as of the very essence of Eternal Life in time and space—we shall at that level find Him in a lived experience of personal union and communion. Living true to the deepest in us we shall touch Him in whom we live and move and have our being. In life and not by intellect only do we make the great discovery. Where intellect bids us halt, faith makes its leap, and thus by a living activity of the whole human personality Godwards do we take hold of Reality Himself, and discovering thus the Divine in Human Life, living in Him and He in us, all questions concerning the possibility of a union between the Divine and Human are answered, not theoretically, but practically. And Faith can claim a closer knowledge of the Truth than was ever possible by means of speculative conjecture and the conclusions of logic.

The rest may reason and welcome,
'Tis we musicians know.

APPENDIX E

F. D. MAURICE. *Tracts for Priests and People*, Chapter XIV, pp. 62 ff. Part of a letter to R. H. Hutton.

YOU used, you say, to find great difficulty in admitting an Incarnation, because you could not understand how an Infinite Being could be manifested in a man, subject to the limitations to which an individual, born in a certain place, growing up in certain circumstances, must be subject. You have overcome that difficulty. It does not shock you to think of Christ as the Son of God, and yet as liable to the ordinary feelings, even to the prejudices, of a Jew in the days of Herod.

That you have felt so deeply the necessity of an Incarnation as to be able to overlook this, or even a worse perplexity, is to me most satisfactory; I could not ask a greater evidence of the power with which the conviction has taken hold of you. But I cannot persuade myself that you have mastered the objection. I think it will start up again and again, and that sometimes it will appear to you almost overwhelming. I should have found it so if I had not been brought to the conviction that the perfect image of God cannot be merely *a* man. He must be *the* Man; the Head of the Race; the Person in whom the race is created; by whom it stands. Such a person, I think, the Evangelists set forth to us. The powers which they say that Jesus exercised, the sufferings which they say He underwent, belong to such a person. You, I suspect, feel the need of such a one as much as I do. But you feel, as I did, that, *contemplated from the human ground*, a universal man is merely the fiction of an antiquated realism. Here, then, is an instance in which fidelity to the theological method [building, that is, on the revelation of God and not on human experience and faith] saves us from the most serious contradictions, brings our language and thoughts

into harmony with that of the Old Church, and its creeds; restores our understanding with simple and devout people; and, at the same time, enables us to complete that idea of a Humanity which is floating in the minds of all at the present day. The fact that Christ must have been born in some time and some place—that He must have been an actual child, and boy, and man—will remain. These are essential to the idea of an Incarnation. There may be, there must be, limitations involved in that birth, childhood, boyhood, manhood; but they will not, I think, be the limitations you have supposed inevitable. They will not interfere with the fulness of the Godhead bodily, *because* they will not interfere with the fulness of the manhood. And that fulness of the manhood will enable not some particular man, subject to particular conditions of time and country, but every man, in every time and country, to claim affinity with Christ, and through Him to draw nigh to the Father.

The prevalent talk about humanity, and a sense of its great unreality, if there is not such a Head of Humanity as this, has certainly been one influence in leading me back to that old Catholic doctrine. But I can trace my conviction of it more distinctly to a terrible question which was brought before me when I was young by that work to which I have already alluded. [Irving *On the human nature of Christ*]

"If the Son of God really became man, must He not have entered into all the temptations of a man? Can the words of the Epistle to the Hebrews be modified? Does the writer's own limitation, '*yet without sin*,' empty the previous clause of its significance?" These are profoundly practical enquiries which cannot be evaded by those who are seeking for a power to govern their own lives, for a help in their own inward struggles. Mr. Irving was confronted by them. He found that he could not maintain the Incarnation in its reality and power if he shrank from the assertion that evil in all its ghastliness, in all its attractiveness, offered itself to the mind and will of Christ. That it was rejected by that Mind and Will no one could affirm more vehemently than he did. But to adopt any shift for the sake of making the conflict a less tremendous one than it is in the case

of any son of Adam seemed to him to be dishonouring Christ under pretence of asserting His purity, and to be depriving human creatures of the blessings and victory which He took flesh to give them. He therefore used language which inevitably startled and staggered those who knew what the suggestions of evil were to them, how much they seemed to involve a participation in it. I could not evade the force of their appeals to the testimony of our consciences as well as of Scripture. I could as little evade the force of his. It seemed to me that if there was not a way out of the difficulty the Gospel meant nothing. The Old Theology which Mr. Irving had grafted upon his Scotch Confession showed me this way. According to *that* confession, the race stood in Adam, and had fallen in Adam; then a scheme of salvation, of which the Incarnation formed a step, was necessary to rescue certain persons from the consequences of the fall. Mr. Irving had begun to regard the Incarnation not merely as a means to a certain end, in which some men were interested, but as the very manifestation of God to men—as the link between the creature and the Creator. But what could the Incarnation on his previous hypothesis be but the descent into a radically *evil* nature? Some of Mr. Irving's Scotch opponents perceived the difficulty and resorted to the hypothesis of our Lord's taking the unfallen nature of Adam. He regarded the suggestion as a miserable subterfuge, which made the relation between Christ and actual men an utterly unreal one. It led me to ask myself, "What does that unfallen nature of Adam mean? Did not Adam stand by God's grace, by trust in Him? Did he not fall by trying to be something in himself? Could he have had a nature which was good independent of God more than we? Is not such a notion a subversion of all Christian belief? But *did* the race ever stand in him?" Old Theology taught quite a different doctrine. Our own Articles set forth Christ very God and very man—not Adam—as now and always head of the race. They teach us of an infection of nature which exists in every son of Adam. They call that departure from original righteousness. This original righteousness

stands and has always stood, in Christ the Son of God, and in Him only. Here, it seemed to me, was the true practical solution of the difficulty. I could believe that the Head of Man had entered fully into the condition of every man; had suffered the temptations of every man; had wrestled with the enemy of every man; and that he had brought *our* humanity untainted and perfect through that struggle. And this because He had never lost His trust in His Father, His obedience to His Father, had never asserted independence, as Adam did, as each one of us is continually doing. His temptations become, then, real in the most tremendous sense. They were more fierce than any mere individual can ever undergo. He did, in truth, feel the sins—bear the sins—of the whole world. And every man may turn to Him as knowing his own special danger, his easily besetting sins, as having felt the power of them. And no man has a right to say, "My race is a sinful, fallen race," even when he most confesses the greatness of his own sin and fall; because he is bound to contemplate his race in the Son of God, and to claim by faith in Him his share in its redemption and its glory. I can therefore do justice to the Unitarian protest against the language in which many who call themselves orthodox describe the condition of mankind, just because I adopt the belief in the perfect divinity and the perfect manhood of the Son of God. I can, with the most inmost conviction, assert that in me—that is, in my flesh—dwelleth no good thing, just because I feel that all good which is in me, or in anyone, is derived from the perfect humanity of Christ, and that apart from that I am merely evil. Just so far as I have been able to grasp this belief in a Head of Humanity—just so far the greatest problems of ethics seem to me to find a solution, just so far do I see a light in the midst of the deepest darkness, a hope rising out of the depths of despair, a unity which is mightier than all sects and divisions. Therefore I am earnest that you should consider whether you are not confusing this belief with that of a merely individual Christ, such as you were content with before you saw the necessity of an Incarnation.

APPENDIX F

GEORGE MACDONALD. *Unspoken Sermons.* Third Series, pp. 6-14.

As to what the life of God is to himself, we can only know that we cannot know it—even that not being absolute ignorance, for no one can see that, from its very nature, he cannot understand a thing, without therein approaching that thing in a most genuine manner. As to what the life of God is in relation to us, we know that it is the causing life of everything that we call life—of everything that is: and in knowing this we know something of that life by the very forms of its force. But the one interminable mystery, for I presume the two make but one mystery—a mystery that must be a mystery to us for ever, not because God will not explain it, but because God himself could not make us understand it—is first, how he can be self-existent, and next, how He can make other beings exist: self-existence and creation no man will ever understand. Again, regarding the matter from the side of the creature—the cause of his being is antecedent to that being; he can therefore have no knowledge of his own creation; neither could he understand that which he can do nothing like. If we could make ourselves we should understand our creation, but to do that we must be God. And of all ideas this—that with the self-dissatisfied, painfully circumscribed consciousness I possess, I could in any way have caused myself, is the most dismal and hopeless. Nevertheless, if I be a child of God, I must be *like* Him, like even in the matter of this creative energy. There must be something in me that corresponds in its childish way to the eternal might in him. But I am forestalling. The question now is: What was that life, the thing made *in* the Son—made by

him inside himself not outside him—made not *through* but *in* him—the life that was his own, as God's is his own? (cf. St. John v, 26.)

[Macdonald is commenting on St. John i, 3, punctuating as in R.V. mg. and translating—"All things were made *through* him; and without him was not anything made. That which has been made (or come into being) *in* him was life."]

It was, I answer, that act in him that corresponded in him, as the son, to the self-existence of his father. Now what is the deepest in God? His power? No, for power could not make him what we mean when we say *God*. Evil could, of course, never create one atom; but let us understand very plainly that a being whose essence was only power would be such a negation of the divine that no righteous worship could be offered him: his service must be fear, and fear only. Such a being, even were he righteous in judgment, yet could not be God. The God himself whom we love could not be righteous were he not something deeper and better still than we generally mean by the word—but, alas, how little can language say without seeming to say something wrong! In one word, God is Love. Love is the deepest depth, the essence of his nature, at the root of all his being. It is not merely that he could not be God, if he had made no creatures to whom to be God; but love is the heart and hand of his creation; it is his right to create, and his power to create as well. The love that foresees creation is itself the power to create. Neither could he be righteous—that is, fair to his creatures—but that his love created them. His perfection is his love. All his divine rights rest upon his love. Ah, he is not the great monarch! The simplest peasant loving his cow is more divine than any monarch whose monarchy is his glory. If God would not punish sin, or if he did it for anything but love, he would not be the father of Jesus Christ, the God who works as Jesus wrought.

What then, I say once more, is in Christ correspondent to the creative power of God? It must be something that comes also of love; and in the Son the love must be to the already existent. Because of that eternal love which has no beginning the Father must have the Son. God could not love, could not be love, without making things to love. Jesus has God to love; the love of the Son is responsive to the love of the Father. The response to self-existent love is self-abnegating love. The refusal of himself is that in Jesus which corresponds to the creation of God. His love takes action, creates, in self-abjuration in the death of self as motive; in the drowning of self in the life of God, where it lives only as love. What is life in a child? Is it not perfect response to his parents? thorough oneness with them? A child at strife with his parents, one in whom their will is not his, is no child; as a child he is dead, and his death is manifest in rigidity and contortion. His spiritual order is on the way to chaos. Disintegration has begun. Death is at work in him. See the same child yielding to the will that is righteously above his own; see the life begin to flow from the heart through the members; see the relaxing limbs; see the light rise like a fountain in his eyes, and flash from his face. Life has again its lordship.

The life of Christ is this—negatively that he does nothing, cares for nothing for his own sake; positively that he cares with his whole soul for the will, the pleasure of his father. Because his father is his father, therefore he will be his child. The truth in Jesus is his relation to his father; the righteousness of Jesus is his fulfilment of that relation. Meeting this relation, loving his father with his whole being, he is not merely alive as born of God; but, giving himself with perfect will to God, choosing to die to himself and live to God, he therein creates in himself a new and higher life, and, standing upon himself, has gained the power to awaken life, the divine shadow of his own, in the hearts of us his brothers and sisters, who have come from the same birth-home as himself, namely, the heart of his God and our God,

his father and our father, but who, without our elder brother to do it first, would never have chosen that self-abjuration which is life, never have become alive like Him. To will, not from self, but with the Eternal is to live.

This choice of his own being, in the full knowledge of what he did; this active willing to be the Son of the Father, perfect in obedience—is that in Jesus which responds and corresponds to the self-existence of God. Jesus rose at once to the height of his being, set himself down on the throne of his nature, in the act of subjecting himself to the will of the Father, as his only good, the only *reason* of his existence. When he died on the cross he did that in the wild weather of his outlying provinces, in the torture of the body of his revelation, which he had done at home in glory and gladness.

From the infinite beginning—for here I can only speak by contradictions—he completed and held fast the eternal circle of his existence in saying, "Thy will not mine be done." He made himself what he is by *deathing* himself into the will of the eternal Father, through which will he was the eternal Son—thus plunging into the fountain of his own life, the everlasting Fatherhood, and taking the Godhead of the Son. This is the life that was made *in* Jesus: "That which was made in him was life." This life, self-willed in Jesus, is the one thing that makes such life—the eternal life, the true life, possible—nay, imperative, essential, to every man, woman and child, whom the Father has sent into this outer, that he may go back into the inner world, his heart. As the self-existent life of the Father has given us being, so the willed devotion of Jesus is his power to give us eternal life like his own—to enable us to do the same. There is no life for any man, other than this same kind that Jesus has; his disciple must live by the same absolute devotion of his will to the Father's; then is his life one with the life of the Father.

Because we are come out of the divine nature, which chooses to be divine, we must *choose* to be divine, to be of

God, to be one with God, loving and living as he loves and lives, and so be partakers of the divine nature, or we perish. Man cannot originate this life; it must be shown him, and he must choose it. God is the Father of Jesus and of us—of every possibility of our being: but while God is the Father of his children, Jesus is the father of their sonship; for in him is made the life which is sonship to the Father—the recognition namely, in fact and life, that the Father has his claim upon his sons and daughters. We are not and cannot become true sons without our will willing his will, our doing following his ruling. It was the will of Jesus to be this thing God willed and meant him that made him the true son of God. He was not that Son of God because he could not help it, but because he willed to be in himself the son that he was in the divine idea. So with us: we must *be* the sons we are. We are not made to be what we cannot help being; sons and daughters are not after such fashion! We are sons and daughters in God's claim; we must be sons and daughters in our will. And we can be sons and daughters, saved into the original necessity and bliss of our being, only by choosing God for the Father he is, and doing his will—yielding ourselves true sons to the absolute Father. Therein lies human bliss—only and essential. The working out of this our salvation must be pain, and the handing of it down to them that are below must ever be in pain; but the eternal form of the will of God in and for us is intensity of bliss.

"And the life was the light of Man."

APPENDIX G

" Allah, Allah," cried the sick man,
Racked with pain the long night through,
Till with prayer his heart grew tender,
Till his lips like honey grew.

But at morning came the tempter,
Said, " Cry louder, child of pain.
See if Allah ever answer
' Here am I again.' "

Like a stab the cruel cavil
To his brain and pulses went,
To his heart an icy coldness,
To his brain a darkness sent.

Then Elias stood before him,
Said, " My child, why thus dismayed ?
Dost repent thy former fervour ?
Is thy heart of prayer afraid ? "

" Ah," he said, " I've cried so often,
Never heard the ' Here am I '—
And I said God will not answer,
Will not turn on me His eye."

Then the grave Elias answered:
" God said, ' Rise, Elias, go,
Speak to him, the sorely tempted,
Lift him from his gulf of woe.

Tell him that his very longing
Is itself an answering cry,
That his prayer, " Come, Gracious Allah,"
Is my answer, ' Here am I.' "

Every inmost aspiration
Is God's angel undefiled,
And in every " O my Father "
Slumbers deep a " Here, my child."

(Translated from the Persian by the German scholar Tholuck.)

Printed in Great Britain by
Hazell, Watson & Viney, Limited, London & Aylesbury.

DATE DUE

DEC 31 '76

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

77122

92
D85m

AUTHOR DuBose As A Prophet of Unity/

TITLE Murray, J.O.F.

DATE LOANED	BORROWER'S NAME	DATE RETURNED

77122 92
D85m

St. Mark's Library
The General Theological Seminary
175 Ninth Avenue
New York, N. Y. 10011

Please stamp date in left column, write your name legibly in center column and leave right column blank. Deposit circulation card in slot marked 'Circulation cards'.

There is no date due, but books must be returned promptly upon request. Do not lend books charged to you to others. You are responsible for them.